MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, FRIDAY, JUNE 21, 1946.

A Committee Meeting, attended by the architect members of the Commission of Fine Arts, was held at the Office of Mr. L. Andrew Reinhard, 145 East 32d Street, New York City, on the afternoon of Friday, June 21, 1946. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke -
Mr. Reinhard,
Mr. Aldrich,
Mr. Murphy,
also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

Chairman Clarke gave authority to act in his absence, and arranged to inspect several of the designs on the following Monday.

1. DESIGN FOR ARMY MEDICAL LIBRARY: Mr. Otto Eggers, of the firm of Eggers & Higgins, Architects, 542 Fifth Avenue, New York City, submitted a design for the Army Medical Library, with letter as follows:

New York City, June 21, 1946.

The Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D.C.

Re: Army Medical Library,
Contract No. W-49-080 eng-285

Gentlemen:

Preliminary plans for the new Army Medical Library building located on Capitol Hill, Square 787, are submitted herewith for approval by the Commission.

General Dimensions:

The building is 270' - 10" long (facing East Capitol Street), 225' 10" wide (facing Third and Fourth Streets) and 75' - 0" high (measured from planting level on East Capitol Street at elevation 93'-0" to top of parapet at elevation 168' - 0".

East Capitol Street front - Distance from building line to curb - 60' - 0".

Third and Fourth Streets fronts - Distance from building line to curb - 47' - 1".

These measurements, including height, are in agreement with earlier decisions of the Commissions.

Since the entire building is to be occupied by the Army Medical Library and not shared with the Museum, it has been possible

to simplify the design, providing one main entrance on East Capitol Street. At the request of the Commission of Fine Arts, sculptural features have been added, flanking the main entrance.

The action taken by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in changing the width of East Capitol Street from 160 feet to 120 feet wide, has made it possible to add the very desirable feature of parking space for approximately 195 cars inside the building. By being permitted to move the building northward on the site, sufficient area was gained on the south side to allow for two ramps leading down to the sub-basement. These ramps are completely covered and are entered at doors placed at the outside line of the planting area on A Street.

In order to avoid the necessity of having one or more objectionally high cooling towers on the roof, the alternate scheme of using a low spray pond is suggested.

Your consideration of these plans for approval will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,
EGGERS & HIGGINS,
Otto R. Eggers

Delivered by hand to the Commission at their meeting in New York City, June 21, 1946.

It was noted that the elevations of the building were not materially changed. They were improved by proposed sculpture each side of the main entrance.

The spray pond on the roof was approved, with the suggestion that a parapet wall be provided to tie in the two bulkheads.

The design was approved, subject to the above suggestions, and Mr. Eggers was informed accordingly (Exhibit A).

2. DESIGN FOR "X-RADIATION BUILDING": Mr. Gilbert Stanley Underwood, Supervising Architect, Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency, submitted a design for an "X-Radiation Building," to be built at the Bureau of Standards. He explained the purpose of the building. The design, which indicated a very small addition to the building, was inspected, and no objection was made to its erection on the grounds of the Bureau of Standards.

3. DESIGN FOR ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Underwood submitted a preliminary perspective sketch for an Administration Building in the group for the Bureau of Standards. He stated that the personnel offices are now scattered

in various laboratories and the purpose of this proposed building, which is to be rather centrally located, is to provide office space for them in one building. Studies will be submitted to the Commission later.

3. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS:

(a) Store Building for 501 G Street, N.W. (Application No.1092): The Secretary submitted a revised design for this building. Mr. Reinhard, who had given this matter particular attention at a previous meeting of the Commission, inspected the design, and approved it with the suggestion that a light green stone be used.

(b) Automobile Garage and Sales Building: The Secretary submitted a design for a building to be built by the Call Carl Inc., submitted by the Board of Zoning Adjustment, together with a copy of a letter as follows:

COPY

National Capital Park and Planning Commission

June 11, 1946

The Board of Zoning Adjustment,
District Building,
Washington 4, D.C.

Subject: Appeal 1565 for Gasoline Service Station

Gentlemen: In accordance with the provisions of Section XXIII, Part 2, Paragraph 10 of the Zoning Regulations, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission submits the following report on Appeal No.1565 of Call Carl, Inc., for permission to establish an automobile sales and service building together with repair shop and gasoline service station in conjunction therewith, at 439-455 H Street, N.W., and on Lots 852 and 853 in Square 517.

This property lies in the middle of the square facing the north side of the proposed General Accounting Office building and in this instance would seem to be an appropriate establishment for this locality. The site is at present an open parking lot, and the improvements along this frontage consist of old 2 and 3-story dwellings with some mixture of commercial use. The new Government building and the proposed service center should provide a stimulus to be redevelopment of the remainder of the frontage. It is believed there would be no adverse effect on the Gospel Mission Chapel at the corner of 5th and H Streets, nor on the Church on 5th Street between G and H Streets.

It is presumed that some of the 150 carespaces provided in the building will be available for parking of cars not needing repair. This would be a desirable facility for the neighborhood. Furthermore

in various laboratories and the purpose of this proposed building, which is to be rather centrally located, is to provide office space for them in one building. Studies will be submitted to the Commission later.

3. ARCHITECTURAL-DESIGN APPROVALS:

(a) Office Building for Coal & Power, ... (application No.1028): The secretary submitted a revised design for this building. Mr. Reinhard, who had given this matter particular attention at a previous meeting of the Commission, inspected the design, and approved it with the suggestion that a light green stone be used.

(b) Automobile Garage and Office Building: The secretary submitted a design for a building to be built by the Vail Mfg. Co., received by the Board of Zoning Adjustment, together with a letter as follows:

Date

National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Washington 4, D.C.

The Board of Zoning Adjustment,
District Building,
Washington 4, D.C.

June 11, 1945

Gentlemen: In accordance with the provisions of Section XXIII, Part 2, Paragraph 10 of the Zoning Regulations, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission submits the following report on Appeal No.1265 of Vail Corp., Inc., for permission to construct an automobile sales and service building together with repair shop and greasing service station in conjunction therewith, at 4238-42 3 Street, N.W., and on Lots 826 and 393 in Square 2174.

This property lies in the middle of the square facing the north side of the proposed General Accounting Office building and in this instance would seem to be an appropriate establishment for this locality. The site is at present an open parking lot, and the improvements along this frontage consist of old 2 and 3-story dwellings with some mixture of commercial use. The new Government building and the proposed service center should provide a stimulus to be redevelopment of the remainder of the frontage. It is believed there would be no adverse effect on the Capitol Plaza Park to the rear of 4th and K Streets, nor on the Church on 5th Street between I and K Streets.

It is presumed that some of the 150 carspaces provided in the building will be available for parking on days not needing repair. This would be a desirable facility for the neighborhood. Furthermore

H Street, due to the fact that it is not a through street, would be a good distributor of the traffic going to and from the service center. No entrance or exit should be provided from Massachusetts Avenue which is predominantly residential although in the commercial zone. For this reason no gasoline service facilities should be located on the lots facing Massachusetts Avenue.

The frontage in question is in the process of being added to the area which comes under the provisions of the Shipstead Act. In view of this fact, it is recommended that the plans of the proposed service center be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for a report and recommendation as to any change which that Commission believes necessary to prevent any "impairment of the public values" belonging to the General Accounting Office building.

Subject to approval of the plans by the Commission of Fine Arts, it is recommended that the appeal for the service center building be granted as conforming with the city plan and the future development of the neighborhood.

The appeal and other papers submitted to the Commission by the Administrative Assistant to the Zoning Specialist on May 6, 1946, E. D. No.247282-2, are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,
A.E.Demaray,
Acting Executive Officer.

The design was inspected. It suggested a building of modern design with much structural glass for the exterior wall facing the street (H Street), where it would be opposite the proposed General Accounting Office Building.

The design was disapproved. The suggestion of Mr. Reinhard was adopted that a revised design for the front and rear of the building be submitted (Exhibit B).

4. DESIGNS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDINGS AND BRANCH LIBRARY: Mr. Merrel A. Coe, Acting Municipal Architect, submitted the following designs:

Morse and Twining Schools, 5th, N.J.Ave. & P Streets, N.W., revised to be the Winfield Scot Montgomery School. Design inspected and approved (Final action by the School Board on erection of the school is pending, Mr. Coe said).

Kelly Miller Junior High School, 49th Street & Washington Place, N.E.: Stair towers to be restudied, and revised design to be submitted.

John Philip Sousa Junior High School; near Fort Dupont: Stair towers to be restudied; smaller opening. Revised design to be submitted.

H Street, due to the fact that it is not a through street, would be a good distributor of the traffic going to and from the service center. No entrance or exit should be provided from Meadowmeadow Avenue which is predominately residential although in the commercial zone, for this reason no gasoline service facilities should be located on the lots facing Meadowmeadow Avenue.

The frontage in question is in the process of being zoned to the area which comes under the provisions of the Unlimited Act. In view of this fact, it is recommended that the plans of the proposed service center be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for a report and recommendation as to any change which that Commission believes necessary to prevent any "impairment of the public values" belonging to the General Accounting Office Building.

Subject to approval of the plans by the Commission of Fine Arts, it is recommended that the appeal for the service center building be granted as conforming with the city plan and the future development of the neighborhood.

The appeal and other papers submitted to the Commission by the Administrative Assistant to the Zoning Executive on May 9, 1946, S. O. No. 24725B-R, are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

"E. Lemert",

Zoning Executive Officer.

The design was inspected. It suggested a building of modern design with

much structural glass for the exterior wall facing the street (H Street),

where it would be opposite the proposed General Accounting Office Building.

The design was disapproved. The suggestion of Mr. Reinhart was

adopted that a revised design for the front and rear of the building be

submitted (Exhibit B).

4. MEETING FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL SITE(S) AND MAYFAIR LIBRARY: Mr. Lemert

A. Coe, Acting Municipal Architect, submitted the following designs:

Morse and Training School, 5th, N.J.Ave. & P Streets, N.E., revised to be the Wingfield Post Elementary School. Design inspected and approved (Final action by the School Board on erection of the school is pending, Mr. Coe said).

Kelly Miller Junior High School, 49th Street & Nashington Place, N.E.: Stair towers to be reduced, and revised design to be submitted.

John Philip Sousa Junior High School: Rear Port Import: Stair towers to be reduced; smaller opening. Revised design to be submitted.

Anacostia Branch Library: A restudy of the main facade was recommended; open lobby,-more space in front of elevator. Inscription should be more dignified. A revised design is to be submitted to the Commission.

5. DESIGN FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBER: The Secretary reported that on Friday, June 14th, at 10:30 a.m., a meeting was held in the Office of Honorable Fritz G. Lanham, Chairman of the House Committee for the Remodeling of the House of Representatives Chamber. It was attended by Congressman Lanham, Congressman Holmes of Massachusetts, and Congressman Sol Bloom, as also by Mr. Murphy, Mr. Lawrie, Mr. Finley and the Secretary, representing the Commission of Fine Arts; Hon. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol; and Mr. Francis P. Sullivan, Associate Architect, and Mr. William H. Livingston, representing the firm of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston & Larson, Consulting Architects, for the project.

The designs, which had been submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts and approved, subject to the submission of working drawings, were carefully inspected by the Members of the House of Representatives present. On motion moved and seconded, the designs were approved by the Committee and the members present attached their names to the plans.

Mr. Lanham made a report concerning the designs (House Report No.2321), Exhibit C, and also made a brief statement on the floor of the House, as reported in the Congressional Record of June 24th (Exhibit C-1).

6. DESIGNS FOR THEATER OF OPERATIONS MEDALS: The Secretary presented the following letter from Mr. Lawrie:

June 19, 1946.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

I should appreciate your reading this to the members at the meeting in New York:

After attending the meeting for the House Committee's consideration and approval of designs for the Senate and House chambers, Mr. Caemmerer telephoned Mr. Dubois, who said he had received

Duncastle Branch Library: A revised of the main facade was recommended; open lobby--more space in front of elevator. Inscription should be more dignified. A revised design is to be submitted to the Commission.

6. UNITED IVA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBER: The Secretary reported that on Friday, June 14th, at 10:30 a.m., a meeting was held in the Office of Honorable Fritz C. Lumbum, Chairman of the House Committee for the Remodeling of the House of Representatives Chamber. It was attended by Con Chairman Lumbum, Congressmen Holmes of Massachusetts, and Congressman Gol Bloom, as also by Mr. Murphy, Mr. Lawrie, Mr. Totty and the Secretary, representing the Commission of Fine Arts; Hon. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol; and Mr. Francis P. Sullivan, Associate Architect, and Mr. William G. Livingston, representing the firm of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston & Larson, Consulting Architects, for the project.

The designs, which had been submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts and approved, subject to the submission of working drawings, were carefully inspected by the Members of the House of Representatives present. On motion moved and seconded, the designs were approved by the Committee and the Members present attended their names to the plans.

Mr. Lumbum made a report concerning the designs (House Report No.2881), Exhibit 3, and also made a brief statement on the floor of the House, as reported in the Congressional record of June 24th (Exhibit 4-J).

6. DESIGNS FOR CEMENTS OF CONSTITUTION AVENUE: The secretary presented the following letter from Mr. Lawrie:

June 19, 1940.

Dear Mr. Demarest:

I should appreciate your reading this to the members at the meeting in New York:

After attending the meeting for the House Committee's consideration and approval of designs for the ornate end posts changers, Mr. Demarest telephoned Mr. Lawrie, who said he had received

the pencil drawings for the campaign medals from the sculptors, and we went over to the War Office, where Mr. Dubois showed us the drawings.

There is no marked distinction in the designs.

The Weinman eagle, however, is excellent, and an improvement over the first model. I would recommend a better arrangement of the lettering.

The Pacific design by Amateis will make a fine medal. It has medal character and beauty. I agree with Mr. Dubois's criticism that the figures in the foreground should show more action.

I think something more expressive is needed for the American medal, by Cecere.

The European drawings by Jones have promise, but like the design for the American medal, lack expression.

I realize it isn't easy to find the right motives, and it occurs to me that it might be finer for these medals to have a short inscription added, by the Commander-in-Chief; or, one by General Eisenhower for the European medal; one by General McArthur for the Pacific medal; and one by the Commander for the American Campaign.

Sincerely yours,
Lee Lawrie.

Also, the Secretary presented a letter from Major General T. B. Larkin, The Quartermaster General (Exhibit D),which was read.

The designs and models submitted were inspected. The criticisms by Mr. Lawrie were endorsed. The designs and models were then referred to the Chairman for further action.

The Chairman embodied the suggestions and criticisms by Mr. Lawrie in a report to Major General Larkin (Exhibit D-1)

7. DESIGN FOR TELEVISION TOWERS: The Secretary presented a set of drawings received from the Inspector of Buildings (Application No.1093) for Television Towers at 4600-40th Street, N.W.

The design was inspected, and its location near the Woodrow Wilson High School was noted. It was also noted that the towers were to be 300 feet high mounted on a one story limestone building about 50 feet square.

the Pencil Drawings for the European Medals from the Secretary,
and we went over to the War Office, where Mr. Gooch showed us the
drawings.

There is no marked distinction in the designs.

The Wyllman eagle, however, is excellent, and an improvement over
the first model. I would recommend a better arrangement of the
lettering.

The Pacific design by Mayers still needs a fine medal. It has
medal character and beauty. I agree with Mr. Babcock's criticism
that the figures in the foreground should show more action.

I think something more expressive is needed for the American
medal, by Deeore.

The European drawings by Cooch have promise, but like the
design for the American medal, lack expression.

I realize it isn't easy to find the right motives, and it occurs
to me that it might be finer for these medals to have a short
inscription added, by the Commander-in-Chief, or, one by General
Pleanwowe for the European medal; one by General Logan for the
Pacific medal; and one by the Commander for the American Campaign.
Sincerely yours,
Lee Lawrie.

Also, the Secretary presented a letter from Major General J. T. Larkin,
the Quartermaster General (Exhibit D), which was read.

The designs and models submitted were inspected. The criticisms by
Mr. Lawrie were approved. The designs and models were then referred to
the Chairman for further action.

The Chairman embodied the suggestions and criticisms by Mr. Lawrie
in a report to Major General Larkin (Exhibit D-1)

7. REVIEW FOR TELEVISION TOWER: The Secretary presented a set of
drawings received from the Inspector of Buildings (Application No.1023)
for Television Tower at 6600-66th Street, N.W.

The design was inspected, and its location near the Woodrow Wilson
High School was noted. It was also noted that the towers were to be 300
feet high mounted on a one story limestone building about 60 feet square.

The question arose whether some other building material should be used, in view of the fact that the Woodrow Wilson High School, which is colonial in style, is nearby.

Mr. Murphy suggested the use of local stone to match the school wall opposite. This was discussed, but Mr. Reinhard said the use of that would require a re-design. The use of limestone as desired for the building was thereupon unanimously agreed to by the architect members of the Commission.

8. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL: Mr. Murphy reported that he had a conference with Mr. Frederick H. Brooke, architect, regarding the design for the proposed D. C. World War II Memorial. Mr. Murphy said no conclusion was reached, and it was agreed that the subject should be further discussed at a future meeting with the architect members of the Commission.

The Secretary reported that recently it has been reported by the War Department that there are 3,029 District of Columbia World War II dead to be commemorated, instead of 2,000 as was reported by Mr. Brooke several months ago.

9. NEW FOURTEENTH STREET HIGHWAY BRIDGES: The Secretary reported that he had heard that the SubCommittee on Interestate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives had a meeting with regard to the Twin Bridges to replace the existing old Highway Bridge at Fourteenth Street, and that they favored the scheme of having two four-lane bridges for outgoing and incoming traffic to one six lane bridge. (The full committee reported favorably on the Bill, H.R.541 on June 26th (Exhibit E); it was adopted unanimously by the House of Representatives on July 3, 1946, and similarly by the United States Senate on July 10, 1946 (Exhibit E-1); and was approved by the President on July 16, 1946 (Exhibit E-2).

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

June 28, 1946

Dear Mr. Eggers:

The Commission of Fine Arts approve the design for the new Army Medical Library, to be built on Square 787, along East Capitol Street, directly east of the Folger Shakespeare Library. The design indicates that it will be a beautiful, monumental building. It is understood that the exterior will be faced with white marble.

The Commission suggest that a single penthouse be provided on the roof by tying the two smaller ones together by parapet walls to enclose the spray pond.

It is understood that models for the sculptured figures proposed at the entrance to the building will be submitted to the Commission in due time.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Mr. Otto Eggers,
Eggers & Higgins, Architects,
542 Fifth Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT A

June 28, 1926

Dear Mr. Eggers:

The Commission of Fine Arts approve the design for the new Army Medical Library, to be built on Square 727, along East Capitol Street, directly east of the Folger Shakespeare Library. The design indicates that it will be a beautiful, monumental building. It is understood that the exterior will be faced with white marble.

The Commission suggest that a single pentiouse be provided on the roof by tying the two smaller ones together by parapet walls to enclose the spray pond.

It is understood that models for the sculptured figures proposed at the entrance to the building will be submitted to the Commission in due time.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Mr. Otto Eggers,
Eggers & Higgins, Architects,
642 Fifth Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

COPY

June 25, 1946

The Board of Zoning Adjustment,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Sirs:

The accompanying design for a Service Center (Call Carl Inc.), on H Street, between Fourth and Fifth Streets, Northwest, was disapproved at a meeting held on June 21, 1946, for the reason that a building built in accordance with the design proposed was thought to be inappropriate for the location mentioned, opposite the General Accounting Office Building that has been authorized by Congress.

The Commission of Fine Arts recommend that the architect be requested to submit a revised design for the H Street side, and also one for the rear; reducing the glass area so as to get more wall surface and simple design for limestone facing.

Respectfully,

H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary

EXHIBIT B

COPY

June 25, 1946

The Board of Zoning Adjustment,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Sirs:

The accompanying design for a Service Center (Galt Carl Inc.), on R Street, between Fourth and Fifth Streets, Northwest, was disapproved at a meeting held on June 21, 1946, for the reason that a building built in accordance with the design proposed was thought to be inappropriate for the location mentioned, opposite the General Accounting Office Building that has been authorized by Congress.

The Commission of Fine Arts recommend that the architect be requested to submit a revised design for the R Street side, and also one for the rear; reducing the glass area so as to get more wall surface and simple design for limestone facing.

Respectfully,

E. F. Clemmerer,

Secretary

Union Calendar No. 705

79TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 2321

RECONSTRUCTION OF ROOFS AND SKYLIGHTS OVER HOUSE AND SENATE WINGS OF THE CAPITOL AND REMODELING OF HOUSE AND SENATE CHAMBERS

JUNE 24, 1946.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. LANHAM, from the Special Committee on Reconstruction of Senate and House Roofs and Skylights, submitted the following

REPORT

[Pursuant to Public Law 155, 79th Cong.]

The special House committee appointed under Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, at a meeting Friday, June 14, 1946, approved the plans for remodeling the House Chamber submitted by the Architect of the Capitol.

These plans, prepared by Francis P. Sullivan, associate architect, and Harbeson, Hough, Livingston, and Larson, consultants, in collaboration, have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Architect of the Capitol, and are acceptable to the several consultants on air conditioning, lighting, and acoustics, and to the structural engineers.

The committee has instructed the Architect of the Capitol to keep the plans on exhibit in his office for the 2 weeks' period commencing today, June 24, 1946, and ending Monday, July 8, 1946, for inspection and comment by any Members of the House who may wish to examine the plans. Any Member who examines the plans and wishes to submit comments or criticisms is requested to submit the same in written statement form to the Architect of the Capitol, who will refer any statements received to the committee.

The committee also approved the report of the Architect of the Capitol on the project, describing the plans and recommending that the remodeling work be postponed until the summer of 1947.

Exhibit C

The report of the Architect of the Capitol follows:

ALTERATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF INTERIOR OF SENATE AND HOUSE CHAMBERS AND RECONSTRUCTION OF ROOFS AND SKYLIGHTS OVER SENATE AND HOUSE WINGS OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL BUILDING

APPROVAL OF PLANS

The Architect of the Capitol presents for the consideration and approval of the House committee appointed under the act of July 17, 1945, Public Law 155 Seventy-ninth Congress, the plans for the House Chamber improvements authorized by that act.

Before proceeding with a discussion of these plans, I wish to advise that the Senate committee appointed under Public Law 155 approved the plans for the Senate Chamber improvements on May 22, 1946.

The act of July 17, 1945, authorizing the remodeling of the Senate and House Chambers and requiring approval of the remodeling plans by the Senate and House committees, provides in pertinent part, as follows:

"* * * the appropriation of $585,000 provided in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, approved June 27, 1940, as amended * * * for the reconstruction of the roofs and skylights over the Senate and House wings of the United States Capitol * * * shall be available also for the substitution of reinforced concrete roof slab for the skylights over the Senate and House Chambers, reconstruction of ceilings, redecoration, acoustical treatment, improved lighting, and other alterations, changes, and improvements in such Chambers: *Provided further*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated * * * such additional amounts as may be necessary for the additional improvements herein authorized: *Provided further*, That the project, insofar as it affects the Senate wing of the Capitol, shall be carried forward by the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with plans to be approved by a committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, upon recommendation of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds: *Provided further*, That the project, insofar as it affects the House wing of the Capitol, shall be carried forward by the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with plans to be approved by a committee of five Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, upon recommendation of the chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

"SEC. 2. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution for a total amount not exceeding $861,000 in addition to the aforesaid appropriation of $585,000 heretofore provided in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 27, 1940."

The plans, as submitted, represent designs developed by Francis P. Sullivan, associate architect, and Harbeson, Hough, Livingston, and Larson, consultants, in collaboration. The designs have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Architect of the Capitol, and they are acceptable to the several consultants on air conditioning, lighting, and acoustics, and to the structural engineers. In their present form, they are the result of the combined efforts and ideas of all concerned with their preparation.

The plans are described on pages 6, 7, and 8 of this report.

TIME OF PERFORMANCE OF WORK IN HOUSE CHAMBER

Delays that have occurred under the project to date, explained on pages 9, 10, and 11 of this report, together with present unsettled industrial conditions, make it necessary for the Architect of the Capitol to recommend that the work of improving the House Chamber not be undertaken until the summer of 1947. The Senate committee has already approved deferment of the Senate Chamber remodeling work until that date.

The Commissioner of Public Buildings, several large construction companies, and other sources have been consulted with regard to industrial conditions, and it is their consensus of opinion that in order to even attempt the House and Senate Chamber improvements this summer, it would be necessary to perform the work under noncompetitive contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

Moreover, there is still such a critical scarcity of essential building materials, and labor conditions are such that there is little likelihood that contractors could live up to fixed delivery schedules necessary to complete the job within a restricted period.

These facts are borne out forcefully in two letters which I have received—one from Commissioner Reynolds to Colonel Dryden of the Veterans' Administration, and the other from the Consolidated Engineering Co. to the Architect of the Capitol.

NEED FOR APPROVAL OF PLANS AT PRESENT TIME

Due to the proposed adjournment of Congress in July of this year and, at least, the possibility that Congress might not return until the following January, it is urgent that the plans for the House Chamber improvements be approved by the House committee prior to such adjournment. Because of the time required, after approval of the plans, for the preparation of the detailed working drawings and specifications, inviting bids, award of contracts, and fabrication and delivery of materials to the site, the project cannot be started promptly in July 1947 if the House committee waits until after the new Congress convenes in January 1947 to approve the plans.

TIME REQUIRED AND PROPOSED PROCEDURE AFTER APPROVAL OF PLANS

It is estimated that, after the plans for the House Chamber improvements are approved by the House committee, from 3 to 4 months will be required for preparation and completion of the detailed working drawings and specifications, and for inviting bids and awarding contracts.

It is the plan of the Architect of the Capitol, once the plans have been approved by the House committee, to have the associate architect and consulting engineers proceed with the completion of the working drawings and specifications, and in either the latter part of November or early part of December 1946 to invite bids, and to submit the bids to the Senate and House committees for consideration, and to request such additional legislation as may be necessary to provide whatever increase in the authorized limit of cost may be required.

If the contracts are placed in January or February 1947, the materials necessary to start the work can be fabricated and delivered to the site by July 1947, it being estimated that from 4 to 5 months will be required for such deliveries.

INCREASED COSTS

Now that the plans have been developed and the various improvements desired by the Senate and House committees incorporated, and materials required for the job determined, it is estimated that in the light of present conditions, in order to accomplish the project as presently planned, it will be necessary to request that the authorized limit of cost of $1,446,000 fixed for the project by the acts of June 27, 1940, and July 17, 1945, be substantially increased.

Due to present unsettled conditions, an accurate estimate of the amount required cannot be made at this time; but it is certain that a substantial increase will be necessary. The original estimate included a reserve for features which could not be determined in advance of a more or less detailed study by the architects and engineers engaged for the different branches of the work. It is now apparent that this reserve will be more than exhausted by such items as improvements in the air-conditioning and lighting systems, improvements in architectural treatment recommended by the consultants and the Commission of Fine Arts, stainless-steel ceilings, insulation of roofs, sound-amplifying system for the House Chamber, and new seating on the floor of the House.

Although there is no definite assurance that the improvements will cost less as a result of the deferment of the project, there is at least the expectation that the Government will have the benefit of closer and more intelligent competition from bidders under more favorable conditions. There will also be the advantage that before an increase in the authorized limit of cost of the project is requested, an estimate more nearly approaching the ultimate cost can be prepared based on actual bid prices.

DESCRIPTION OF PLANS FOR HOUSE CHAMBER IMPROVEMENTS

In remodeling the House Chamber, it is planned to retain certain features which have become an inseparable part of the Chamber in the course of time. The flag will be placed behind the Speaker's chair, hung as at present, but framed in a columned motif and flanked by sculpture symbolizing the Nation's lawmaking body. The oil paintings of Washington by Vanderlyn and Lafayette by Ary Scheffer are to be placed on the same wall of the Chamber, centered between the doors, and suitably framed.

In the scheme of decoration of the room, the base and the central motif (Speaker's rostrum) will be of a marble of a depth of color and veining such as that used in the old Supreme Court room in the Capitol, and the walls, with their fluted pilasters and panels, and the cornice are to be of wood cabinet work, painted in the manner of the early Republic, the frieze in the cornice being a darker tone. The clock over the rostrum, to be done by a sculptor, flanked by suitable allegorical figures, will be of marble and bronze; grilles for the sound-amplifying system will be of bronze, located over the doors.

In order to obtain adequate space in the Press Gallery and space needed for the proper installation of public-address equipment, the south of the Chamber will be brought forward about 1 foot and the north wall brought forward to correspond.

The gallery will have new upholstered, noiseless seats of new type with arms and ends designed in harmony with the new room, the Press Gallery to be widened and enlarged and provided with new desks and seats. The new gallery floor construction will be of fireproof material, arranged in steps. The face of the steps will be of marble, the floor platforms of a noiseless material such as cork tile.

The door frames and the wainscot will be of light marble; over the doors will be sculptured panels in high relief depicting such suitable symbols as the trade and commerce of the country and its natural resources, or appropriate incised inscriptions. The panels between the doors will be of acoustical material, faced with a velour brocade.

The main cornice of the room and the coffered border of the ceiling will be of plaster, painted. Air conditioning for the galleries will be introduced through semicircular outlets in this flat border portion of the ceiling near the walls.

The center of the ceiling, higher and of curved section springing from a cove which will contain continuous light sources screened from view, will be constructed of stainless steel, painted, and perforated with small holes, which will serve as the means of introducing the air conditioning for the central part of the room. The air chamber above this perforated ceiling will be lined with acoustic material.

In the center of the ceiling will be an ornamental feature of carved shatterproof glass, illuminated from above, to furnish a visible source of direct light for the appearance of the Chamber. The main lighting will be indirect in nature—from the cove lights around the center of the ceiling, mentioned above, from lights on the top of the wall in front of the gallery (all sources screened from view), and from other sources placed about the Chamber; the final lighting arrangement to be the result of a test demonstration at full scale now arranged for.

The scheme of decoration has been studied to harmonize with the architecture of those portions of the Capitol Building of the period of the early Republic, insofar as this can be done while providing for throughly modern lighting, air conditioning, and acoustic treatment.

The Members' seats on the floor of the Chamber will be replaced with new and more comfortable seating, and will be rearranged so as to eliminate the seats in the row nearest the south wall, which are inferior from the point of view of vision and hearing, and to place more seats in the section in front of the Speaker's desk. In this rearrangement the aisles will lead more directly to the exits and space will be obtained for enlarging the galleries.

It is recommended that the seven portrait busts formerly in niches in the upper walls be placed in more dignified setting in the domed lobby of the old House Office Building. It would be impossible to have busts all around the room, as some of the niches are such in front only without any depth. It is also recommended that the fresco painting of Washington at Yorktown by Brumidi be carefully removed and reset in a suitable location elsewhere.

While the plans and the descriptions together present a view of the House Chamber substantially as that Chamber is intended to be when remodeled, it is anticipated that some changes may be found necessary or desirable in materials, methods, and design as the working drawings are developed and opportunity is afforded for more detailed study of the problems involved. The architectural character, however, will be preserved, and the necessities of air conditioning, illumination, acoustics, and other practical features will have the most serious consideration.

RECONSTRUCTION OF ROOFS

The present roof construction with its skylights and iron trusses will be removed and replaced by reinforced concrete slabs and structural steel beams supported on steel trusses. The skylights in the House and Senate connections between the central portion of the building and the wings will likewise be eliminated and replaced by a concrete and steel roof. The new roof structure will be fireproof throughout. The existing cast-iron ceiling with its glass panels will be removed

from each Chamber and such disposition made of the glass panels as may be decided upon. The roof will be insulated and covered with sheet copper. New air-conditioning ducts will be run below the new roofs, eliminating the old ducts which are now on top of the roofs and thereby materially improving the air view of the building.

DELAYS ENCOUNTERED

When the Senate and House Chamber improvements were authorized by Congress in Public Law 155, approved July 17, 1945, the Architect of the Capitol advised the Senate and House committees, appointed under that law, that in order to have the materials fabricated and delivered to the site in time to start construction work within and above the Chambers on July 1, 1946, it would be necessary for the plans to be approved by the committees and the working drawings completed, bids advertised for, and contracts awarded by March 1, 1946.

This schedule has been upset, due to delays over which the Architect of the Capitol has had no control.

In the first instance, the Senate committee decided on July 31, 1945, that in addition to procuring the services of Mr. Sullivan as associate architect, the Architect of the Capitol should also employ Mr. Paul P. Cret as consultant to act as censor and critic of the Senate Chamber plans prepared by Mr. Sullivan, to confer with Mr. Sullivan and the Architect of the Capitol in the course of the preparation of such plans and drawings, and to recommend to the Architect of the Capitol any changes or improvements in such plans considered desirable.

While a contract was being negotiated with Mr. Cret in August 1945, Mr. Cret was taken seriously ill, and died on September 8, 1945. The committee was informed of his death and the Architect of the Capitol requested that he be advised as to the committee's wishes in the matter of the selection of another consultant.

The Senate committee, together with three members of the House committee, met on October 5, 1945; and at that meeting, which was also attended, upon invitation of the committee, by members of the Commission of Fine Arts, both the Senate and House committees requested the Commission of Fine Arts to recommend an architect to serve in the capacity in which it had been intended to have Mr. Cret act.

On October 8, 1945, the Commission of Fine Arts recommended to the Senate and House committees that Mr. Cret's successors in office—Messrs. Harbeson, Hough, Livingston, & Larson, architects of Philadelphia—be employed as consultants for the Senate and House Chambers improvements.

The House committee approved the selection of these architects to serve as consultant for the House Chamber improvements on November 23, 1945; and the Senate committee approved the selection of these architects to serve as consultant for the Senate Chamber improvements on November 26, 1945.

A contract was entered into with Harbeson, Hough, Livingston, & Larson on December 4, 1945.

Prior to the employment of the consultants, Mr. Sullivan proceeded as far as he could with his sketches and preliminary plans, but only limited progress could be made until the consultants were employed.

During the period December 4, 1945, to May 1946, Mr. Sullivan has collaborated and conferred closely with the consultants; also with the acoustical, air-conditioning and lighting experts, and the structural engineers; and all matters of consequence have been taken up and discussed at length with the Architect of the Capitol. Meetings have been held in the office of the Architect of the Capitol at which the various consultants have been represented and differences of opinion ironed out. Meetings have also been held with the Commission of Fine Arts and their recommendations have been incorporated in the plans. Numerous changes have been considered, and repeated revisions made in the plans in an effort to obtain the best architectural results without sacrificing acoustical, lighting, air-conditioning, and structural-engineering requirements.

Had it not been for the circumstances herein enumerated, the plans developed and agreed upon during the period December 4, 1945, to April 1946, would normally have been developed and agreed upon during the period September 1, 1945, to January 1946.

Additional time has also been required to check the availability of materials proposed to be used, and to make a study of the effects that present unsettled industrial conditions would have, particularly with regard to costs, on attempting to carry forward the Senate and House Chamber improvements this year.

○

Extract from The Congressional Record
June 24, 1946, page 7526

Remodeling and Redecorating House Chamber

Mr. LANHAM, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Members that the special committee appointed by the Speaker with reference to the remodeling and redecorating of the House Chamber is today filing its report. The plans are on display in the office of the Architect of the Capitol and will be there for 2 weeks. Any Member who wishes to see these plans may do so. It will be appreciated if any Member who so desires will offer any criticism or comment that may be helpful.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the Gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman contemplate that this repair work will be done within the course of the next 2 years or 4 years?

Mr. LANHAM. The work certainly cannot be done at present and will not be done until the situation is better with references to labor and material. No contractor at present would enter into a contract to do the work. But there is a great deal of preliminary work to be done in the preparation of the plans.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXHIBIT C-1

Remodeling and Redecorating
House Chamber

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Members that the special committee appointed by the Speaker with reference to the remodeling and redecorating of the House Chamber is today filing its report. The plans are on display in the office of the Architect of the Capitol and will be there for 2 weeks. Any Member who wishes to see these plans may do so. It will be appreciated if any Member who so desires will offer any criticism or comment that may be helpful.

Mr. ALBERT H. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT H. ANDREWS. Does the gentleman contemplate that this repair work will be done within the course of the next 2 years or 4 years?

Mr. LANHAM. The work certainly cannot be done at present and will not be done until the situation is better with reference to labor and material. To contractor at present would enter into a contract to do the work. But there is a great deal of preliminary work to be done in the preparation of the plans.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

COPY

Army Service Forces
Office Of The Quartermaster General
Washington, D.C.

Address Reply To THE
QUARTERMASTER GENERAL
Att: Military Planning Division

19 June 1946

Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir:

In accordance with informal discussions held with you by General Middleswart, Colonel Finks and Mr. Arthur E. Du Bois of this office, designs for the three Campaign Medals for World War II have been requested from the following sculptors:

Mr. Thomas Hudson Johes
Mr. A.A. Weinman
Mr. Edmond Amateis
Mr. Gaetano Cecere

These sculptors have submitted designs in accordance with informal agreement which had been reached with Mr. Lee Lowrie of your Commission and the individual sculptors.

Mr. Weinman has submitted a photograph of the proposed reverse for the three Campaign Medals which consists of an eagle, close, standing upon a rock, with the inscription "United States of America" above and back of the eagle and the designation "1941-1945" in front of the eagle. The lettering and figures have been put on the photograph in ink. It is the opinion of this office that the lettering as shown is slightly out of scale. In other words, it should be slightly increased in size and should be moved from the present position so that the word "United" reads before the words "States" and "States" reads before the word "America". It is also possible that the year designation might be slightly moved, however, from a heraldic viewpoint the eagle facing the dexter position on this model is far superior to the one that was previously submitted by Mr. Weinman a few years ago for this same purpose. In that instance the head of the eagle was facing over the back of the bird, looking to sinister.

AMERICAN CAMPAIGN MEDAL

There are two designs that have been submitted by Mr. Gaetano Cecere. Design No. 1 does not introduce elements in the opinion of the War Department that would be representative of the American Campaign.

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D.C.

8.

COPY

Army Service Forces
Office of the Quartermaster General
Washington, D.C.

Address Reply To The
QUARTERMASTER GENERAL,
Attn: Military Planning Division

19 June 1946

Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sirs:

In accordance with informal discussions held with you by General Middlesworth, Colonel Finke and Mr. Trilling, in Dale of this office, designs for the three Campaign Medals for World War II have been requested from the following sculptors:

Mr. Thomas Hudson Jones
Mr. A.A. Weinman
Mr. Edmond Amateis
Mr. Gaetano Cecere

These sculptors have submitted designs in accordance with informal agreement which had been reached with Mr. Mac Agnis of your Commission and the individual sculptors.

Mr. Weinman has submitted a photograph of the proposed reverse for the three Campaign Medals which consists of an eagle, close, standing upon a rock, with the inscription "United States of America" above and back of the eagle and the designation "Pacific" in front of the eagle. The lettering and figures have been put on the photograph in ink. It is the opinion of this office that the lettering as shown is slightly out of scale. In other words, it should be slightly increased in size and should be moved from the present position so that the word "United" reads before the words "States" and "States" reads before the word "America". It is also possible that the over design might be slightly moved, however, from a heraldic viewpoint the eagle facing the center position on this medal is far superior to the one that was previously submitted by Mr. Weinman a few days ago for this same purpose. It does improve the mood of the eagle was facing over the back of the hand, looking to eliminate.

AMERICAN CAMPAIGN MEDAL

There are two designs that have been submitted by Mr. Weinman. Design No. 1 does not embrace elements the principal

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D.C.
JUN 20 1946
NOTED

Design No. 2 illustrates various elements which appear to be disconnected. The sword is pointing downward, indicating defeat. There are two shields shown thereon which are not heraldically correct in the fact that they have the letters "U.S." imposed thereon. If these are to be representative of the shield portion of the coat of arms of the United States they should be paly of thirteen pieces and should indicate a "chief", however, as illustrated, they show a shield divided "per fess". A "chief" occupies one-third the area of the shield, whereas the "per fess" divides the shield horizontally in the middle.

There is also transmitted a plaster model designed by Mr. Thomas H. Jones which introduces the figure of Columbia, holding a shield in her right hand and a sword and palm branch in her left, standing in front of a slight relief map of North and South America which does not embody or include the territory of Alaska. It is the opinion of the War Department that this composition is much more representative of the desires of the Navy and War Departments than the composition shown by the sketches produced by Mr. Cecere.

Inasmuch as there was an informal suggestion regarding this figure made by Mr. Lee Lowrie there is inclosed a pencil sketch which shows the figure of Columbia holding a spear in her left hand instead of the sword and palm branch.

ASIATIC-PACIFIC CAMPAIGN MEDAL

Two designs for the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal were received from Mr. Amateis. In studying the composition of this medal, it is desired to invite attention to the fact that representatives of the Navy Department and War Department desire that this medal incorporate an invasion or landing scene of a tropical nature, that introduces palm trees.

The design submitted which involves the symbol of the Atom bomb does not comply with this concept. The second design submitted shows figures disembarking from a ship. It is believed that this composition is too peaceful in appearance and does not show an actual invasion composition which embodies action, force and speed of an actual invasion or landing. If lettering is to be a part of the medal design, it is believed that it should appear on the obverses of all three medals. If, however, the lettering is to be used the designation should be changed to read "Asiatic-Pacific Theater". There is also inclosed a copy of the communication from Mr. Amateis describing the composition of his design.

There is also transmitted a plaster model executed by Mr. Thomas H. Jones which introduces a com osite scene of a landing operation with palm trees in the foreground with three figures advancing, with others landing, with ships firing in the background, with planes flying and shell fire bursting in the water. This particular model was prepared at the informal direction of the War and Navy Department representatives who desired this invasion scene.

EUROPEAN-AFRICAN-MIDDLE-EASTERN-CAMPAIGN-MEDAL

An informal query to General Eisenhower brought forth the expression that he desired an invasion scene to be used for this medal.

There are numerous designs submitted that were prepared by Mr. Thomas H. Jones for the obverse of this medal. These pencil sketches are inclosed. One of these seemed to be more favorably considered by Mr. Lee Lowrie on his recent visit to this office, which involves a landing barge filled with American personnel ready to disembark, in front of a ship with an air plane flying in the distance. This sketch has the inscription "D-Day" thereon, however, it is believed that if the medals are to have inscriptions on the face thereof, the inscription "D-Day" should be changed to "European-African-Middle-Eastern Campaign".

There is also submitted a plaster model of a composite invasion scene that was prepared by Mr. Thomas H. Jones that shows figures wading toward the foreground in a landing barge with some of the figures wading toward land with a half-track on the shore and other transportation with figures on land, planes overhead and shells bursting.

There is inclosed a copy of Circular 56, War Department, 26 February 1946, which authorizes these campaign medals.

It is requested that these designs be submitted to the membership of your Commission, advising this office of the action of the Commission together with advice as to the merits of the designs submitted so that this office may transmit them to the War and Navy Departments for concurrence prior to advising the respective sculptors of the findings thereof. If any modifications are deemed appropriate in these designs, it is also requested that such modifications be indicated so that this

office may proceed in the final securing of the plaster models suitable for these medals which are to be awarded to those who have served in these campaigns.

Sincerely yours,

10 Incls.
1-Photograph by A. Weinman
2-2 designs of American Campaign Medal by G. Cecere
3-Plaster model of obverse of American Campaign Medal by Mr. Jones
4-Sketch of obverse of American Campaign Medal by Mr. Jones
5-2 designs of obverse of Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal by E. Amateis
6-Ltr. fr/E. Amateis dtd. 6 June 46
7-Plaster model of obverse of Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal by Mr. Jones
8-29 sketches of EAME Campaign Medal by Mr. Jones
9-Plaster model of EAME Campaign Medal by Mr. Jones
10-Circular 56

T.B. LARKIN
Major General
The Quartermaster General

AED
JEF
WHM
WJM

ls

June 28, 1946

Dear General Larkin:

This will acknowledge your letter of June 19th, with accompanying drawings, photographs and models, which were presented to the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting held on Friday, June 21, 1946.

The Commission concur with you that the design for the reverse for the three Campaign Medals , prepared by Adolph A. Weinman, is eminently satisfactory. The Commission is much pleased with it, subject of course to the appropriate design and arrangment of the inscription "United States of America" and "1941 - 1945." We agree with your comments with respect to the lettering and the dates.

The Commission would be pleased to see a photograph of the model after the lettering and dates have been added.

American Campaign Medal

The Commission reviewed all of the submissions for this medal and find none satisfactory. It is respectfully suggested that Mr. Cecere submit further designs for this medal in the form of pencil sketches.

Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal

The Commission believe that the submission in the form of a drawing by Mr. Edmond Amateis, showing soldiers disembarking from a ship, should make a fine medal. We agree with you that "this composition is too peaceful in appearance and does not show an actual invasion composition

Exhibit D-1

June 24, 1942

Dear General Larkin:

This will acknowledge your letter of June 14th, with accompanying drawings, photographs and models, which were presented to the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting held on Friday, June 21, 1942.

The Commission concur with you that the design for the reverse for the three Campaign Medals, prepared by Adolph A. Weinman, is eminently satisfactory. The Commission is much pleased with it, subject of course to the appropriate design and arrangement of the inscription "United States of America" and "1941 - 1945." We agree with your comments with respect to the lettering and the dates.

The Commission would be pleased to see a photograph of the model after the lettering and dates have been added.

American Campaign Medal

The Commission reviewed all of the submissions for this medal and find none satisfactory. It is respectfully suggested that Mr. Weinman submit further designs for this medal in the form of pencil sketches.

Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal

The Commission believe that the submission in the form of a drawing by Mr. Edmond Amateis, showing soldiers disembarking from a ship, should make a fine medal. We agree with you that "this composition is too peaceful in appearance and does not show an actual invasion composition

which embodies action, force, and speed." We believe that the sculptor should be given the opportunity to restudy this and make a new submission in the form of a plaster model which incorporates the suggestions you have made, retaining, however, the general composition shown in the drawing. We like the border lettering which should, of course, be changed to read "Asiatic - Pacific Theater" and should occupy the top half, thus leaving more space at the lower half of the obverse of the medal for an extension of the figure composition and the stylized indication of water.

European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal

The Commission believe that the drawing prepared by Mr. Thomas Hudson Jones showing a landing barge filled with soldiers ready to embark, in front of a ship with an airplane in the distance, would, with further study, make a satisfactory design. Like the design submitted by Mr. Amateis, it lacks the action and the force and speed of an invasion scene. We believe, however, that the compsition has posibilities and we would like to have it studied and cast in plaster. We would like to have the lettering descriptive of the theater on this obverse and suggest the possibility of arranging it in three lines across the upper third (the sky area) of the obverse; we believe this might be decorative and distinguished and that it would help the composition. Also we would like to see the plaster model when finished.

The design, etc., are returned herewith.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Major General T. B. Larkin,
The Quartermaster General,
War Departmint,
Washington, D. C.

Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman

which embodies action, force, and speed." We believe that the sculptor should be given the opportunity to restudy this and make a new submission in the form of a plaster model which incorporates the suggestions you have made, retaining, however, the general composition shown in the drawing. We like the border lettering which should, of course, be changed to read "Asiatic - Pacific Theater" and should occupy the top half, thus leaving more space at the lower half of the obverse of the medal for an extension of the figure composition and the stylized indication of water.

European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal

The Commission believe that the drawing prepared by Mr. Thomas Hudson Jones showing a landing barge filled with soldiers ready to embark, in front of a ship with an airplane in the distance, would, with further study, make a satisfactory design. Like the design submitted by Mr. Weinman, it lacks the action and the force and speed of an invasion scene. We believe, however, that the composition has possibilities and we would like to have it studied and cast in plaster. We would like to have the lettering descriptive of the theater on this obverse and suggest the possibility of arranging it in three lines across the upper third (the sky area) of the obverse; we believe this might be decorative and distinguished and that it would help the composition. Also we would like to see the plaster model when finished.

The design, etc., are returned herewith.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Major General T. H. Larkin,
The Quartermaster General,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman

79TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 2346

AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO FOUR-LANE FREE HIGHWAY BRIDGES ACROSS THE POTOMAC RIVER TO REPLACE EXISTING HIGHWAY BRIDGE AT OR NEAR FOURTEENTH STREET, WASHINGTON, D. C.

JUNE 26, 1946.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 541]

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 541) authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "construct" insert a comma and "maintain, and operate".

Page 2, line 6, after "$7,000,000." insert "in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters', approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations in this Act."

Page 5, after line 8, add a new section as follows:

SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

The Subcommittee on Bridges held extensive public hearings on this bill during which, after due notice of the hearing, every agency, organization, and person expressing a desire to be heard was given ample opportunity to be heard or to submit a written statement for the record. The hearings have been printed.

The members of the subcommittee made two separate trips to inspect all phases of the conditions prevailing on the ground in the area where these bridges are proposed to be constructed and operated,

including a bird's eye view of the area from the top of the Washington Monument.

The subcommittee has had the benefit of oral statements by representatives for, and of written reports from, the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, the War Department, the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and numerous civic and professional organizations whose members have an interest in the proposed new bridges.

The bill has the approval of the War Department, the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency, the Commission of Fine Arts, as will appear by letters attached hereto.

The bill in its present form has been objected to by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and by the Department of the Interior, as will appear by their letters attached hereto.

All of the above last-mentioned letters were before the subcommittee during the period of the public hearings on this bill.

This bill is identical with H. R. 5511, introduced during the Seventy-eighth Congress, by the Honorable Jennings Randolph, at the request of the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, and reintroduced as H. R. 541 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, by Mr. Randolph who was the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia when both bills were introduced by him.

Subsequent to the completion of the public hearings on the bill, the committee received the following letter, with enclosure, from the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICES,
Washington 4, D. C., June 7, 1946.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEA: I know that you will be interested in a letter which I received today from Mr. Matthew J. Connelly, secretary to the President, expressing the interest of the President in the Commissioners' plan to replace with two bridges the present crossing at Highway Bridge.

The Commissioners are aware of the assistance you have been lending this study and feel that the views of the President will be of considerable interest to you.

With kind regards, I am,
Yours sincerely,

JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 6, 1946.

Hon. JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG,
President, Board of Commissioners,
Washington 4, D. C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER YOUNG: The President has directed that I advise you that he favors the two-bridge plan for replacement of the present Highway Bridge across the Potomac River.

He has also directed that a copy of this letter be sent to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Bureau of Public Roads.

Very sincerely yours,

MATTHEW J. CONNELLY,
Secretary to the President.

The bill was submitted to the full committee by a unanimous report of the Subcommittee on Bridges and there was no objection to the bill being reported from the full committee to the House with a recommendation that bill as amended be passed.

The following are the letters and reports mentioned:

REPORTS ON H. R. 5511, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

WAR DEPARTMENT, *January 5, 1945.*

Respectfully returned to the chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives.

So far as the interests committed to this Department are concerned, I know of no objection to the favorable consideration of the accompanying bill, H. R. 5511, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes, since, under the provisions of the General Bridge Act of March 23, 1906, the location and plans for the structures must be approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War before construction is begun. This approval is not granted until full investigation shows that the structure will afford adequate clearances for navigation. Changes desirable in the bill to accord with the form adopted by the Commerce Committees of Congress for bridge bills have been indicated in red on the accompanying copy.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report, with the understanding that no commitment is thereby made as to the relation of this legislation to the program of the President.

HENRY L. STIMSON, *Secretary of War.*

AMENDMENTS SUGGESTED BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT TO H. R. 5511, 78TH CONGRESS

(1) Page 1, line 4, after the word "construct" insert a comma and "maintain, and operate".

(2) Page 2, line 6, after "$7,000,000" change the period to a comma and insert "in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters', approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations in this Act."

(3) Page 5, after line 8, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved."

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, November 25, 1944.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LEA: Careful consideration has been given to the bill, H. R. 5511, transmitted with your letter of November 22, with request for a report thereon, together with such comment as this Agency may desire to make relating thereto.

This bill would authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River. In view of the interests of the Federal Works Agency in the proposed crossing and the objections raised by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, I feel it is desirable to set forth our reasons for recommending approval of the plan proposed by the bill.

The existing bridge is in very poor condition and will need replacement at an early date. Examination by divers indicates severe scour at some of the piers. The deck, part of which is of timber, needs frequent replacement and the machinery of the draw span is worn to a degree that makes its continued operation uncertain. The District Commissioners initiate projects for highway improvements in

the District of Columbia, are responsible for the location and design of all streets and highways and their effect on the development of the city, and make final decisions in line with their responsibility. Anticipating Federal participation in the cost of replacing existing Highway Bridge, they called the Public Roads Administration in for advice and, consonant with their general policy, sought the advice and counsel of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts.

A detailed study of traffic was made, its probable growth, its pattern and its distribution. A new major bridge over the Potomac River will be a structure as nearly permanent as economically feasible with an estimated life of probably more than 50 years. The investment therein would be ill-advised if it were not adequate for traffic at least 20 years hence. In 20 years the traffic is expected to be over 90,000 vehicles per day and the peak will be over 6,000 vehicles per hour in each direction, a volume of traffic requiring extraordinary design. The approaches were studied for the purpose of determining their capacities and their ability to handle the estimated traffic volume between the bridge and the road system in Arlington on the south and the street system in the District on the north and with a view of destroying as little of recently constructed facilities as feasible. These studies showed that a single two-way bridge with its necessary loop turns for the great number of left-turning vehicles at the bridgeheads would be inadequate and forced the conclusion that it was necessary to provide two one-way bridges, each to carry traffic in one direction, each four lanes wide and one a few hundred feet downstream from the other so that direct paths could be provided for left-turning vehicles. This plan has numerous additional advantages over a single-bridge scheme.

The National Capital Park and Planning Commission stresses the thought that the volume of traffic which can be accommodated by the structure as proposed will overload the streets in the District of Columbia, thus forcing additional expenditure for relief, particularly on Fourteenth Street. This thought is not in agreement with traffic facts. Measurements of traffic volumes on Fourteenth Street indicate that at the present time about one-fourth of the traffic crossing Highway Bridge turns off at Maine Avenue and that despite additions to the traffic stream from the several cross streets, the volume approaching Constitution Avenue is only about one-half and that approaching Pennsylvania Avenue is about one-third of that crossing Highway Bridge. When streets now partially improved are extended in accordance with approved plans additional dispersal of traffic can be expected. A single bridge six lanes wide would be wholly inadequate and not at all equal to the capacities of the approaches. At the present time in both Virginia and the District the discharge capacity of the road and street systems toward the bridgehead is equal to that of three lanes in each direction. The Mount Vernon Memorial Highway at the Virginia bridgehead and Maine Avenue and the Park Road System at the District bridgehead increase the discharge capacity of the approaches toward the bridge to well above that of even four lanes on the bridge in each direction.

The Commission of Fine Arts has unanimously approved the plan to provide two one-way bridges. Its members carefully considered the objections raised by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to the two-bridge plan because of the possible impact on the Jefferson Memorial and took the view that esthetically it was much superior to a single wide bridge. The Potomac River should be crossed with the driver and occupants relaxed while passing through dignified surroundings worthy of an approach to the Nation's Capital. On a single two-way bridge an approaching passenger vehicle will be driven between the line of trucks on the outside lane on the right and all opposing traffic on the left, On a one-way bridge drivers and occupants will look through and over an open rail and see the bridge for south-bound traffic beyond an expanse of water, the Memorial Bridge in the distance and the Jefferson Memorial and the Washington Monument through and over the trees, more or less casually.

The proposed design as a solution to fit the requirements of traffic and in balance with the approaches has been reviewed by numerous engineers qualified to study such problems and all arrived at the conclusion that the general plan as proposed is the one that will best satisfy all requirements. The highway committee of the American Automobile Association, the postwar planning committee of the Keystone Automobile Club and all citizens' associations which have considered the project have gone on record approving the two-bridge scheme.

Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant 3d, as Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, has written Commissioner Thomas H. MacDonald on several occasions outlining his objections to the proposed plan from the standpoint

of city planning for the District and has suggested the adoption of a single bridge, six lanes wide, located to clear the existing draw span on the north. These were given serious consideration but the conclusion reached was that neither traffic nor the interests of the District would be served by a bridge which soon would be unable to accommodate the traffic that would inevitably use the structure. The highway administrator in an urban area must and does consider city planning as a prime factor in his determinations because the location and design of arterial routes in cities can favorably or adversely affect the city's stabilization or development. However, when it was decided that an adequate crossing of the Potomac River should be provided in the general vicinity of the existing bridge it then became a design responsibility. We are in full agreement with the District Commissioners that the design requirements have been satisfied in all respects and in an outstanding manner. We feel that the bill should be given early favorable consideration by the Congress.

In August of this year when a similar bill was proposed for submission to Congress by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the Bureau of the Budget requested an expression of my views thereon. When informed that the Federal Works Agency was in favor of the construction of two 4-lane bridges the Director, without expressing approval or disapproval of the proposed legislation, advised me that there would be no objection by the Bureau of the Budget to the presentation of my views to the appropriate committees of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General, U. S. A., Administrator.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1944.

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LEA: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to report on H. R. 5511, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes. This bill was introduced at the request of the Commissioners.

Section 1 of the bill authorizes and directs the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges across the Potomac River to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge, together with approaches and connecting roads, the south-bound bridge to be constructed as nearly as practicable in the location of the existing bridge, and the north-bound bridge to be constructed within 600 feet of the downstream side of the present bridge, all at a cost not to exceed $7,000,000.

Section 2 provides that the Federal agencies having control and jurisdiction over the lands at and adjacent to the ends of the bridges shall transfer to the Commissioners, at their request, the lands necessary for the construction of the bridges, approaches, and connecting roads, in accordance with plans approved by the Commissioners and the Public Roads Administration.

Section 3 authorizes the Commissioners to acquire by purchase or condemnation all lands in Virginia not under Federal jurisdiction or control which are necessary to completion of the project, title to be taken in the name of the United States, and provides that jurisdiction and control over lands acquired under the bill shall be transferred to the District of Columbia.

Section 4 authorizes the Commissioners to make such use of federally owned and controlled lands at the ends of the proposed bridges as may be necessary for preliminary work, storage of materials, and construction of the bridges.

Section 5 authorizes and directs the Commissioners to route and reroute traffic on or close connecting roads under Federal jurisdiction, and to negotiate with the Virginia authorities for closing of roads, when necessary in connection with the preparation of plans for and actual construction of the bridges, approaches, and connecting roads. It further authorizes the Commissioners to prepare plans for changes in park roads when necessary in the interest of maximum efficiency in handling traffic to and from the bridges, and, on approval of the Public Roads Administration, to construct roads in conformity with such plans.

Section 6 provides for cooperation of the National Capital Park Service and the Commissioners in the regrading and landscaping of areas involved in the construction of the proposed bridges, the regrading to be done by the Commissioners to conform with plans approved by them and the Public Roads Administration, and the landscaping to be done by the National Capital Park Service in accordance with plans prepared by them and approved by the Commissioners and the Public Roads Administration.

Section 7 provides that construction, reconstruction, and repair of all roads which are changed or made necessary incident to the construction of the bridges, approaches, and connecting roads, shall be paid for out of the funds made available for construction of the bridges, approaches, and connecting roads.

The bridges authorized by this bill, as previously stated, are two in number, with four lanes each. The proposed bridges are designed so as to provide not only for anticipated postwar traffic flow, but to adequately serve traffic demands for a reasonable period thereafter. The new bridges as planned will more adequately care for the heavy turning movement of traffic, particularly movements to and from the Mount Vernon Boulevard. The bridges will also provide sufficient lanes for the various classifications of traffic.

The present bridge is located on United States Highway No. 1, the most heavily traveled route into and out of the District of Columbia to and from the north and south. Traffic counts made immediately prior to the war indicated an average daily use in the summer season of approximately 47,000 vehicles per day, of which approximately 18 percent were trucks. The narrow lanes, particularly with the heavy truck traffic present, have been the indirect cause of many accidents, due primarily to sideswiping. On numerous occasions heavy trucks have run into the supporting members of the overhead trusses.

The existing bridge, a four-lane, restricted-capacity structure, was erected in 1903 by the War Department. The bridge and approaches were turned over to the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia by act of Congress in 1921. The original bridge contained tracks of the Mount Vernon Railway, and the roadway space was of buckle plate floor construction. In 1927 due to failure of the buckle plate flooring, the Commissioners replaced the roadway area with a laminated-wood floor, which was covered with asphalt. Subsequently the car tracks were removed and that area filled with concrete with an asphalt covering. While the bridge is considered safe it is not in the best physical condition. It is not capable of carrying the present traffic volume without undue congestion and delay, which reflects itself upon a substantial part of the District of Columbia traffic system. That portion of the flooring system, laminated-wood construction, is in the process of decay. Two or more of the piers are badly scoured with the pile foundation partially exposed. The drawbridge machinery is old and its failure often is the cause of delay to both river and vehicular traffic.

The Commissioners, being fully cognizant of the inadequacy of the present structure to handle traffic and of its existing physical condition, are desirous of replacing the structure at the earliest practicable date. With this end in view funds have been made available for the making of working drawings and specifications, so that when construction funds are available and construction work appropriate, they will be in a position to immediately proceed with the replacement.

A suitable crossing to replace the present Fourteenth Street Bridge has been studied for more than a year by the District Highway Department, the Administrator of Public Roads and his staff, the Fine Arts Commission, and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Except for the latter agency, which recommended a single six-lane-capacity bridge, all are in agreement with the decision of the Commissioners in adopting the plan originally proposed by the Public Roads Administration. The Secretary of the Interior has subsequently advised the Commissioners that he does not concur in their determination.

The Commissioners in making their decision concluded as follows:

"(*a*) To adequately serve present and future traffic needs, including turning movements at the ends of the facility in Virginia and the District, a total capacity of four lanes in each direction is necessary."

Bridge capacity is primarily a question of traffic engineering. As far as known, the Planning Commission has never expressed the opinion that future traffic demands will not require the eight lanes of capacity. It has contented itself with the statement that should future traffic demands exceed the six-lane capacity proposed by it, another bridge should be built at Alexandria. Regardless of the merits of such a bridge, the Commissioners agree with the statement of the Administrator of Public Roads that "it is my considered judgment that it would be unwise to construct a facility of inadequate capacity with the hope that such an act would

cause the building of an additional facility at another location, and that the two combined would solve the problem."

On the other hand, the Commissioners have been impressed by a traffic engineering study presented by T. H. MacDonald, Administrator of Public Roads, after consultation with "several men of extensive experience in urban problems, in the design and construction of modern highways, parkways, and bridges." This analysis "leads to the conclusion that the facility should be designed for a peak load of 5,000 vehicles in each direction for a period of time in excess of an hour, and that about 18 percent of the vehicles should be assumed to be trucks. The 1941 average daily traffic was 44,500 vehicles, of which 15 percent were trucks. The 1960 (probably not more than 10 years after completion) average daily traffic is estimated to be 89,000 vehicles (not allowing for any deflection of peak-hour traffic from Memorial Bridge. Practical peak-hour capacity of Memorial Bridge was reached in 1941). A normal distribution of the expected average daily traffic for 1960 would result in numerous one-way peak loads well in excess of 5,000 vehicles per hour, but the observed distribution at Highway Bridge is such that it would be safe to design for that figure. During such periods of peak traffic any disruption of the smooth flow, such as vehicles slowing down to make loop turns, or a vehicle stopped for any reason, not only backs up traffic but has been known to stop traffic completely. If a facility at Fourteenth Street is constructed for only three lanes in each direction, and the left turning traffic, contributing in excess of one-fourth of the total, is required to negotiate the inner loop of a cloverleaf, it is probable that future traffic will meet congestion, a very compelling reason for constructing at this location a design of complete adequacy and attractiveness to traffic." It might be added that when the decision to build a six-lane bridge over the Anacostia River at Pennsylvania Avenue was made, the existing traffic was less than one-third of that now existing on Highway Bridge, and it was not complicated by heavy truck traffic and exceedingly heavy turning movements. Experience has shown that this decision was correct.

"(*b*) The provision of four-lane capacity in each direction can be most adequately provided by two bridges of four lanes each, and such a facility will not detract from the Jefferson Memorial."

When the two-bridge scheme was first proposed by the Public Roads Administration, the principal objection of the Planning Commission was directed, not to the fact that it would provide excess capacity or direct too much traffic to the midcity area, but that the two bridges would have an adverse aesthetic effect upon the Jefferson Memorial. It employed F. L. Olmsted, expert landscape architect, to study this phase of the subject. Mr. Olmsted submitted a lengthy report, which was referred to the Fine Arts Commission, generally recognized as an authority on such matters. It would seem that the latter's action in approving the two-bridge scheme effectively and authoritatively disposes of the question. As expressed by the chairman: "I do not subscribe to the remarks (of Mr. Olmsted) concerning the 'very regrettable impression' that would be created by having three bridges rather than two across this section of the Potomac River. That statement is very naturally debatable since it is based upon aesthetics and in that area of thought there may be as many answers as there are persons to debate it." In this opinion, the Commissioners concur.

"(*c*) A single six-lane bridge will not meet prospective traffic needs, and any economy in present construction costs will be more than balanced by the cost of another necessary crossing in the future."

It is conceded that the two-bridge scheme will cost 15 to 20 percent more than the single bridge—based upon detailed study of this site by a competent engineering firm, and not a general estimate by someone as a result of which the Park and Planning Commission has announced this excess cost as 35 percent—and it is equally true that a single four-lane bridge, similar to the one now in existence, would be even less expensive. It is the position of the Highway Department, concurred in by the Public Roads Administration, that any facility that does not provide adequately for the purposes intended would be expensive at any price. Unlike a street or highway, which can be widened at reasonable cost when traffic demands. the capacity of a bridge can be reasonably increased only by building another bridge.

"(*d*) Capacity of the approaches in both Virginia and the District, considering both the direct approaches and the possible turning movement, is sufficient to handle the traffic which the bridges can carry."

The Planning Commission has questioned the capacity of the approaches on both the Virginia and District of Columbia ends to handle the traffic which the bridges can carry. On the Virginia side, all agree that the approach system now

planned will lead more than three lanes of traffic to the bridgehead. On the District side, three lanes will flow directly from Fourteenth Street onto the southbound bridge, plus such traffic as may enter from the low level tidal basin bridge and the West Potomac Park roads. While four full lanes may not be needed, less than four would be insufficient, and any excess capacity in the fourth lane will be needed to accommodate slow-moving or broken-down vehicles.

"(*e*) The amount of traffic which will reach Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues will not be in excess of the capacity of those intersections, and will not tend to increase congestion in the midcity area. Any proposed diversion of traffic from this area will depreciate property values therein."

The most recent expression of opinion by the Planning Commission bases its objection to the two-bridge scheme on the fact that "in the opinion of the Commission it will throw a greater volume of traffic into the downtown section of Washington than is good for the general welfare of the city." With respect to this contention, Mr. MacDonald has the following to say: "On the north approach the Maine Avenue grade separation can accommodate three lanes in each direction, and the streets to the north can, or can be made to, distribute this volume easily. Between the bridgehead and the Maine Avenue grade separation considerable traffic will be directed to Fifteenth Street, Seventeenth Street, and East Potomac Park." Traffic studies made during June and July 1944 indicate that 29 percent of the traffic entering the District by way of Highway Bridge turns off to the east at Maine Avenue SW., 17 percent at D Street SW., and 12 percent at Independence Avenue SW. Some 2 percent is added at C Street and a small amount at Independence Avenue. Of the total volume which crosses Highway Bridge, only 47 percent, including traffic that turned in from the east and west, moves on Fourteenth Street north of Adams Drive NW. This north-bound traffic on Fourteenth Street has a street capacity of three lanes when it reaches Constitution Avenue, and assuming that all four lanes over the bridge are used to full capacity, it is difficult to see how 47 percent of this, or less than two lanes, will congest a street with three-lane capacity.

The question of diverting traffic from the business districts of urban communities by the use of bypass routes has recently been the subject of study by a committee of traffic experts. Briefly, it was their conclusion that "even with a bypass, a major part of the traffic will continue to flow through the city to the full capacity of the roads leading to it." They further concluded that any action which tends to divert traffic from the business district, for economic or other reasons (as proposed by the Planning Commission) is poor economy, as property values will be depreciated more than the yearly cost of constructing adequate transportation facilities. Although the Commissioners cannot agree that the present capacity of the facilities along Fourteenth Street will be overloaded by traffic from the two-bridge scheme, they consider that it would be comparatively simple and more economical to increase that capacity than to build a new river crossing.

It is desirable to state that the Commissioners fully appreciate the convictions of the Planning Commission and the Secretary of the Interior in this matter, but should the decision made at this time prove to be erroneous, the Commissioners alone must accept the responsibility. They are fully convinced that in concurring with the Administrator of Public Roads in respect to traffic engineering, and with the Fine Arts Commission in respect to esthetic values involved, they have accepted the best possible advice.

Charts and maps have been prepared substantiating the position taken by officials of the District of Columbia, representatives of the Public Roads Administration, and the Commission of Fine Arts. These charts and maps will be presented to your committee at the time of hearing or at any other time you may desire.

In addition to the agencies which took an active part in preparing the plans adopted, the ultimate plan has been endorsed by many civic and business organizations of the District, including the Washington Board of Trade, the Federation of Citizens' Associations, the Interfederation of Washington, Metropolitan Area, the American Automobile Association, and the Keystone Automobile Club, and by the Arlington County Planning Commission.

The Commissioners urge early enactment of the proposed legislation.

The bill was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and returned to the Commissioners with the advice that there was no objection on the part of that office to presentation of the bill to the Congress.

Respectfully,

JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG,
President, Board of Commissioners.

Enclosures:

1. Letter, dated December 8, 1943, from Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman of Commission of Fine Arts, to Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, endorsing two-bridge plan.
2. Letter, dated January 12, 1944, from Commissioner, Public Roads Administration, to Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, advocating the two-bridge plan and containing an analysis of traffic conditions.
3. Letter, dated June 8, 1944, from Commissioner, Public Roads Administration, to executive officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, supplementing letter of January 12, 1944.
4. Press release, dated July 12, 1944, by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia which outlines the reasons for their decision to approve plans for two four-lane bridges.
5. Tabulation showing average weekday traffic flow for 1941 across Highway Bridge.
6. Statement of traffic facts taken from an average wartime weekday, July 1944:

(Enclosure 1)

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, December 8, 1943.

Maj. Gen. U. S. GRANT 3d,
Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL GRANT: At the last meeting of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, you afforded me the privilege of expressing the views of the Commission of Fine Arts, as well as my own opinion, concerning the relative merits of the two schemes proposed for the Potomac River crossing at Fourteenth Street; I am appreciative of the courtesy extended to the Commission and to me to participate in these discussions.

It appears that the Planning Commission still favors a single bridge providing for six lanes of traffic. While the Commission of Fine Arts would not raise objections to a single six-lane bridge, I feel that those best qualified to judge future traffic volumes in this area are confident that an eight-lane crossing is both desirable and necessary. I personally share that view. In my considered judgment, it would be unwise and short-sighted to authorize the construction of a crossing or crossings providing for less than eight lanes of traffic, for reasons already emphasized by engineers who have testified before the Planning Commission.

In my opinion, altogether too much stress has been placed upon the importance of a bypass route which it is presumed may relieve the central part of the Capital of much through traffic. That is only a hope which is not borne out by experience with traffic flow in other large cities; Washington is no exception to the sound observations which point clearly to the fact that bypass routes around large centers of population frequently do not invite enough through traffic to justify constructing them. It is clear to those who have studied these problems that even with a bypass, a major part of the traffic will continue to flow through the city to the full capacity of the roads leading to it. In the case of Washington, since there are at least two important potentially six-lane highways (Lee Boulevard and U. S. Route No. 1) approaching the Capital on the Virginia side, there is not the slightest doubt, in the minds of those competent to judge, that the Potomac crossing should consist of eight traffic lanes in order to be adequate.

As suggested at the last meeting of the Planning Commission, by prior favorable action on what has already been done respecting road widths on the Virginia side of the river, the Planning Commission now appears to be committed to eight lanes in order to provide a sufficiently spacious and adequate crossing of the Potomac at Fourteenth Street.

Mr. Demaray sent me a copy of Mr. Olmsted's remarks of November 19. Nothing Mr. Olmsted said changes the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts with respect to the problem. The trees referred to are transitory only and should not be deemed invaluable factors in connection with an improvement as important and as long-lived as a bridge. New trees of suitable size and variety should be planted in appropriate locations and in proper relationship to the new composition which will be created as a result of adding a vital major improvement to this section of the Capital.

I do not subscribe to the remarks concerning the "very regrettable impression" that would be created by having three bridges rather than two across the section of the Potomac River. That statement is, very naturally, debatable since it is based upon esthetics and in that area of thought there may be as many answers as there are persons to debate it.

I do not have the time, nor am I inclined to discuss Mr. Olmsted's lengthy memorandum in every detail; however, there is one point that I wish to emphasize, which has to do with the "relationship" of the crossing and the approaches to the Jefferson Memorial. I cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of avoiding an axial relationship between one of the bridges, or of the bridge, and the memorial. To attempt to relate these structures by the use of a formal straight axis would be, in my judgment, a fatal error. The memorial was not designed to be approached on axis from the side and it is my feeling that it may be viewed best from the bridges and approaches if seen off axis through trees, more or less casually. There is great danger in overdoing axial relationships in Washington.

In closing, I shall quote from, and then comment briefly upon a portion of Mr. Olmsted's report (p. 5). He states that "Mr. Nolen * * * inclines strongly to the opinion that traffic conditions on these portions of the street system of Washington, through which traffic will flow * * * will limit the actual flow of traffic to and from the bridge or bridges to less than the maximum effective capacity of eight lanes of free moving bridge traffic; and that for reasons of economics, etc." Is it sound economics to advocate a six-lane bridge at Fourteenth Street, which is predicated upon another bridge and another highway (through Alexandria and Maryland) to serve as a bypass? The engineers of the Public Roads Administration tell us that, based upon past experience, the bypass will probably not attract a large volume of through traffic. It seems to me that Mr. Olmsted's conclusions are predicated very largely upon Mr. Nolen's judgment in traffic matters; I prefer to base my judgment upon the training and experience of those who deal almost exclusively with problems of this sort.

These remarks are set forth more forcefully than is my custom. However, I feel confident that if less than an eight-lane crossing, which requires two bridges, is planned to cross the Potomac at Fourteenth Street the Planning Commission and others responsible for the decision will be severely criticized for having been shortsighted and for having neglected to take the advice of those who are most competent to pass judgment upon this problem.

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE, *Chairman.*

(Enclosure 2)

PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION,
January 12, 1944.

Maj. Gen. ULYSSES S. GRANT 3D,
Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL GRANT: A number of conferences have been held among the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Fine Arts Commission, District of Columbia officials and Public Roads Administration personnel for the purpose of reaching general agreement as to the basic location and design of a new crossing of the Potomac River to replace ultimately the present Highway Bridge. At a meeting on November 19, 1943, attended by myself, the idea of designing a single structure to carry eight lanes was discarded, and your Commission asked for comparative studies of two solutions. A discussion of these solutions, one for a single two-way structure located upstream from the existing bridge and the other two one-way structures, one on the line of the existing bridge and the other parallel thereto about 500 feet downstream, was presented by Mr. Olmstead and Mr. Nolen at a meeting on December 16, 1943. Our District engineer reported that the studies made by our organization disclosed the need for eight lanes of travel and Mr. Olmstead disclosed the need for approximately 3½ lanes in each direction. In answer to your request, Mr. Swain advised that we would submit for your consideration a further traffic analysis. It was understood that this analysis would cover the general situation but that it particularly would be concerned with showing the relationship between the approaches on both sides of the river and the capacity of the river crossing. It is presumed from your request that, despite the resolution passed at that meeting, you have an open mind regarding the relative merits of the two schemes.

We have referred the plans to several men of extensive experience in urban problems, in the design and construction of modern highways, parkways, and bridges and in the esthetics of city development, all of whom expressed definite opinions that the two-bridge plan is superior to the single-bridge plan. I am in full agreement with these opinions and submit, in addition to the results of the

traffic analysis you requested, reasons for arriving at such conclusion which may not have been presented heretofore.

The analysis of probable traffic leads to the conclusion that the facility should be designed for a peak load of 5,000 vehicles per hour in each direction for a period of time in excess of an hour and that about 18 percent of the vehicles should be assumed to be trucks. This conclusion is drawn from numerous factors, the salient ones being as follows:

1941 average daily traffic was 44,500 vehicles, of which 15 percent were trucks.

1943 average daily traffic would be 53,500 vehicles if traffic had been allowed to develop normally.

1960 average daily traffic is estimated to be 89,000 vehicles (not allowing for any deflection of peak hour traffic from Memorial Bridge. Practical peak hour capacity of Memorial Bridge was reached in 1941).

A normal distribution of the expected average daily traffic for 1960 would result in numerous one-way peak loads well in excess of 5,000 vehicles per hour but the observed distribution at Highway Bridge is such that it would be safe to design for that figure. There have been isolated and exceptional instances where 5,000 vehicles per hour have been accommodated on three traffic lanes but in these cases few trucks were included, movement was slow and the approaches were entirely free of hindrance due to turning vehicles. During such periods of peak traffic any disruption of the smooth flow, such as vehicles slowing down to make loop turns or a vehicle stopped for any reason not only backs up traffic but has been known to stop traffic completely. If a facility at Fourteenth Street is constructed for only three lanes in each direction and the left turning traffic, constituting in excess of one-fourth of the total, is required to negotiate the inner loop of a cloverleaf, it is probable that future traffic will meet congestion, a very compelling reason for constructing at this location a design of complete adequacy and attractiveness to traffic. Any inadequacy here definitely will tend to force a commercial use of Memorial Bridge. As you so aptly stated in a recent talk, traffic floods cannot be confined within inadequate banks. There is grave danger that an inadequacy at Fourteenth Street would flood Memorial Bridge. This bridge—Memorial Bridge—was built to connect national shrines on the two sides of the Potomac River. On the Virginia side lies the Lee Mansion and the Arlington Cemetery. The latter seemingly must undergo extreme expansion and within its expanded environs will repose plots of ground and markers sacred to a larger number of our citizens than could have been expected two decades ago. On the District of Columbia side of the bridge lie the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument, and the National Capitol. The value of maintaining a quiet dignity and serenity to the travel way within and to the travel approaches to these shrines is difficult to overemphasize. The preservation of an appropriate environment for these shrines can be aided by providing an attractive alternate way for those who in the course of their daily work must go from beyond the limits of this area on the west to beyond the limits of the area on the east.

Our traffic analyses find no justification for the building at Fourteenth Street of a facility of doubtful capacity with the hope that such action will compel the building of a bridge at Alexandria. Observations show that whenever in like situations additional facilities are forced by the impact of traffic the original facility needs all that initially was contemplated.

Thus it is my considered judgment that it would be unwise to construct a facility of inadequate capacity with the hope that such an act would cause the building of an additional facility at another location and that the two combined would solve the problem.

The approaches at both ends of the bridge would be in balance with four lanes for each direction, across the river, and out of balance with three lanes. The Pentagon network at Highway Bridge is designed for three full lanes in each direction. Where vehicles must slow down for interchange, added width is provided even at structures. The Mount Vernon Memorial Highway is an excellent traffic facility protected for all time from promiscuous encroachment. With directional interchange the more than 25 percent of traffic which turns between it and Highway Bridge can be efficiently accommodated so that the south approach may conservatively be considered to be equivalent to more than four lanes. On the north approach, the Maine Avenue grade separation can accommodate three lanes in each direction and the streets to the north can, or can be made to, distribute this volume easily. Between the bridgehead and the Maine Avenue grade separation considerable traffic will be diverted to Fifteenth Street, Seventeenth Street, and East Potomac Park; just how much is uncertain but the north approach can handle much more than three lanes. Whether the

fourth lane across the river is used as a full fourth traffic lane or as a speed-change and maneuvering line, is immaterial. The full capacity of a facility, four lanes in each direction, can be handled readily on both approaches.

Two factors which also affect the choice of location are the possibility of excellent architectural treatment of the facility and surrounding area and the extent to which existing structures are used or destroyed. With regard to the former we have the unanimous opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts that the two-bridge scheme is preferable. With regard to the latter, the two-bridge plan utilizes all existing structures on both approaches, whereas the single bridge plan contemplates the destruction of the stone-faced bridge carrying U S 1 over the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, the refilling of a corner of the Pentagon lagoon and the construction of a new bridge under the railroad on the District shore while abandoning the existing bridge nearby. The destruction of existing facilities sometimes is justified, but I could not approve a plan involving the destruction of adequate and cost facilities in the face of a superior plan which utilizes practically all existing facilities.

The correctness of the statement attributed to the Commission in connection with a news release after the meeting on December 16 is recognized fully; namely, that your Commission acts in an advisory and not an action capacity. It is recognized that the District of Columbia and the Public Roads Administration could proceed to design a facility on any basis they might select. It is also realized that your Commission carries sufficient weight to aid or delay the accomplishment of a civic improvement.

The two-bridge solution of the problem under discussion is in my considered judgment so outstandingly superior to any of the other solutions examined that I am confident that if your Commission will give consideration to the data herewith and heretofore presented your findings will coincide with those of the other groups who have analyzed all of the elements of the problem. The weight of evidence and competent opinion are so overwhelmingly on the side of the plan showing two one-way bridges that I would find it most difficult, if not impossible, to approve the single-bridge plan if submitted for Federal participation in its design or construction.

Very truly yours,

THOS. H. MACDONALD,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

(Enclosure 3)

PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION,
June 8, 1944.

Mr. A. E. DEMARAY,
Acting Executive Officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Interior Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DEMARAY: I have your letter of March 7 advising that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission has reaffirmed its previously expressed preference for a single six-lane highway bridge to replace the present Highway Bridge across the Potomac River.

Your letter and the accompanying map have been carefully studied. We are sympathetic to the Commission's desire to "induce a better distribution of and inter-relationship between the residential population and the business and employment centers in the National Capital" but we fail to see how this can be accomplished by limiting the capacity of a Potomac River crossing so that it is not definitely adequate to meet probable traffic volumes and by choosing a design which does not fit the observed traffic turning movements. In my letter of January 12 to General Grant you were given the results of the very thorough analysis made by traffic engineers of wide experience and the figures for probable traffic and percentage of left-turning vehicles lead to the conclusion that the crossing should be designed with two bridges several hundred feet apart, one for each direction of travel, each to be designed four lanes wide. On the same basis a single bridge six lanes wide would not be safely adequate and would fail to fully develop the capacity already constructed on both approaches.

I think it axiomatic that a crossing as important as that over the Potomac River at the Nation's Capital should be designed to serve adequately the probable traffic volume and traffic problem. To provide an inadequate facility with the thought that the overload would sooner compel the building of a bridge at Alexandria goes contrary to all observed traffic history. It is neither sound design nor good city planning.

We cannot agree that the completion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway will reduce appreciably traffic from the south on the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway. The latter is an excellent parkway facility protected for all time from serious encroachment. It is the most direct route for passenger vehicles from the heart of Alexandria. Traffic diverted to the Shirley Highway will more than be made up by the expansion of housing near the Mount Vernon Highway. On the contrary, I look to the eventual increase in the width of the Mount Vernon Highway between Washington and Alexandria to six lanes in accordance with the original design.

You question my statement that the Pentagon network is designed for three through traffic lanes in each direction by calling attention to the fact that Bridge No. 21 is constructed without added width for acceleration and deceleration. A call to any one of several men on our staff would have enabled you to learn why this bridge was not constructed as wide as the others. Be assured that the capacity of the Pentagon net-work approach to Highway Bridge is three full lanes in each direction.

Comparative cost of two designs becomes pertinent only after it is determined that both designs are functionally competent. Two separate one-way bridges would cost slightly more than a single two-way bridge with the same manner of traffic lanes but a comparison of structure costs only is not sufficient. If approaches also are considered, as they must, the total cost for the two-bridge plan would, in my judgment be less than the total cost, including demolition and replacement of the existing structures, of a one-bridge scheme of equal capacity.

You again refer to Mr. Olmsted's report at the November meeting regarding the impact of the two-bridge plan on the Jefferson Memorial and West Potomac Park. This report was given serious consideration not alone but in conjunction with the judgment of others fully competent to judge of the amenities. The predominant opinion favors the two-bridge plan. I am keenly sensitive of the effects of any construction on the National Capital, particularly that required to meet the increasing needs of motor-vehicle travel. The protection of the Arlington National Cemetery and its connection with the Lincoln Memorial from commercial traffic held a place of importance in my thinking when I advocated a long-time adequacy for the Fourteenth Street crossing. The reasons are given in my letter to General Grant.

Sound city planning calls for visualizing the future to the end so well stated in your letter but city planners always are conscious of their inability to wholly control the development of a city and to see precisely all future requirements. It is necessary, therefore, that a plan and its component parts have flexibility so that they can be bent and adjusted to fit changing future needs. A crossing of the Potomac River and its approaches, in keeping with this principle, should have high capacity and be so arranged that it will permit full and continuous movement of all through and turning traffic even though the pattern may change appreciably at different times. These requirements, in my considered judgment, are met by the plan calling for two one-way bridges each four lanes wide, one a few hundred feet downstream from the other, and are not satisfied by one two-way bridge six lanes wide.

I believe the several exchanges of letters and our attendance at meetings of your Commission have covered the ground thoroughly and that further conferences are unnecessary. If, however, your Commission feels that it has further pertinent data to offer, or if it feels that a further conference will help it to a greater familiarity with the data and analysis thereof that brought us to our conclusion, Deputy Commissioner Hilts will, upon request from you, make the necessary arrangements.

The Commission's interest in all highway problems in the area and your keeping me informed of its conclusions are greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

THOS. H. MACDONALD,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

(Enclosure 4)

FOR RELEASE 12 O'CLOCK NOON, JULY 21, 1944

The Commissioners today approved the preliminary plans submitted by Howard, Needles, Tammen & Bergendoff, engineers of New York City and Kansas City, Mo., and awarded to them a contract for the preparation of working drawings for a new crossing of the Potomac River to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge. Associated with this engineering firm,

for consultation concerning architectural features of the design, will be Mr. Henry R. Shipley, Boston architect.

A total of six engineering firms submitted designs and that selected was considered the most satisfactory. Comparisons were based on relative costs, suitability as to engineering features, and general appearance.

The new crossing will consist of two identical bridges, about 500 feet apart, and each with four-traffic-lane capacity. There will be 15 steel-deck girder spans, each approximately 160 feet in length, resting on stone-faced piers. Suitable bascule openings for river traffic will be provided in each bridge.

Following this award, the contractor will be directed to prepare plans to be submitted to the War Department for a permit covering navigation features. The Corporation Counsel will at the appropriate time be directed to prepare the necessary legislation, including the use of such park land as may be needed for the structures and their approaches.

A suitable crossing to replace the present Fourteenth Street Bridge has been studied for more than a year by the District Highway Department, the Administrator of Public Roads and his staff, the Fine Arts Commission, and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Except for the latter agency, which recommended a single six-lane-capacity bridge, all are in agreement with the conclusions discussed below. The Secretary of the Interior has advised the Commissioners that he does not concur in their decision.

(*a*) To adequately serve present and future traffic needs, including turning movements at the ends of the facility in Virginia and the District, a total capacity of four lanes in each direction is necessary.

Bridge capacity is primarily a question of traffic engineering. As far as known, the Planning Commission has never expressed the opinion that future traffic demands will not require the eight lanes of capacity. It has employed no traffic engineer to study this phase of the problem, and as far as known, no member of the Commission nor its staff claims to be an expert on the subject. It has contented itself with the statement that should future traffic demands exceed the six-lane capacity proposed by it, another bridge should be built at Alexandria. Regardless of the merits of such a bridge, the Commissioners agree with the statement of the Administrator of Public Roads that "* * * it is my considered judgment that it would be unwise to construct a facility of inadequate capacity with the hope that such an act would cause the building of an additional facility at another location, and that the two combined would solve the problem."

On the other hand, the Commissioners have been impressed by a traffic-engineering study presented by Mr. T. H. McDonald, Administrator of Public Roads, after consultation with " * * * several men of extensive experience in urban problems, in the design and construction of modern highways, parkways, and bridges * * *." This analysis " * * * leads to the conclusion that the facility should be designed for a peak load of 5,000 vehicles in each direction for a period of time in excess of an hour, and that about 18 percent of the vehicles should be assumed to be trucks. (The) 1941 average daily traffic was 44,500 vehicles, of which 15 percent were trucks. (The) 1960 (probably not more than 10 years after completion) average daily traffic is estimated to be 89,000 vehicles (not allowing for any deflection of peak-hour traffic from Memorial Bridge. Practical peak-hour capacity of Memorial Bridge was reached in 1941.) A normal distribution of the expected average daily traffic for 1960 would result in numerous one-way peak loads well in excess of 5,000 vehicles per hour, but the observed distribution at Highway Bridge is such that it would be safe to design for that figure. * * * During such periods of peak traffic any disruption of the smooth flow such as vehicles slowing down to make loop turns, or a vehicle stopped for any reason, not only backs up traffic but has been known to stop traffic completely. If a facility at Fourteenth Street is constructed for only three lanes in each direction, and the left turning traffic, contributing in excess of one-fourth of the total is required to negotiate the inner loop of a cloverleaf, it is probable that future traffic will meet congestion, a very compelling reason for constructing at this location a design of complete adequacy and attractiveness to traffic. It might be added that when the decision to build a six-lane bridge over the Anacostia River at Pennsylvania Avenue was made, the existing traffic was less than one-half that now existing on Highway Bridge, and it was not complicated by heavy truck traffic and exceedingly heavy turning movements. Experience has shown that this decision was correct.

(*b*) The provision of four-lane capacity in each direction can be most adequately provided by two bridges of four lanes each, and such a facility will not detract from the Jefferson Memorial.

When the two-bridge scheme was first proposed by the Public Roads Administration, the principal objection of the Planning Commission was directed, not to the fact that it would provide excess capacity or direct too much traffic to the midcity area, but that the two bridges would have an adverse esthetic effect upon the Jefferson Memorial. It employed Mr. F. L. Olmsted, expert landscape architect, to study this phase of the subject. Mr. Olmsted submitted a lengthy report, which was referred to the Fine Arts Commission, generally recognized as an authority on such matters. It would seem that the latter's action in approving the two-bridge scheme effectively and authoritatively disposes of the question. As expressed by the chairman: "I do not subscribe to the remarks (of Mr. Olmsted) concerning the 'very regrettable impression' that would be created by having three bridges rather than two across this section of the Potomac River. That statement is very naturally debatable, since it is based upon esthetics and in that area of thought there may be as many answers as there are persons to debate it." In this opinion, the Commissioners concur.

(*c*) A single six-lane bridge will not meet prospective traffic needs, and any economy in present construction costs will be more than balanced by the cost of another necessary crossing in the future.

It is conceded that the two-bridge scheme will cost 15 to 20 percent more than the single bridge—based upon detailed study of this site by a competent engineering firm, and not a general estimate by someone as a result of which the Park and Planning Commission has announced this excess cost as 35 percent—and it is equally true that a single four-lane bridge, similar to the one now in existence, would be even less expensive. It is the position of the Highway Department, concurred in by the Public Roads Administration, that any facility that does not provide adequately for the purposes intended would be expensive at any price. Unlike a street or highway, which can be widened at reasonable cost when traffic demands, the capacity of a bridge can be reasonably increased only by building another bridge.

(*d*) The capacity of the approaches in both Virginia and the District, considering both the direct approaches and the possible turning movements, is sufficient to handle the traffic crossing the river.

The Planning Commission has questioned the capacity of the approaches on both the Virginia and the District of Columbia ends to handle the traffic which the bridges can carry. On the Virginia side, all agree that the approach system now planned will lead more than three lanes of traffic to the bridgehead. On the District side, three lanes will flow directly from Fourteenth Street onto the southbound bridge, plus such traffic as may enter from the low-level Tidal Basin bridge and the West Potomac Park roads. While four full lanes may not be needed, less than four would be insufficient, and any excess capacity in the fourth lane will be needed to accommodate slow-moving or broken-down vehicles.

(*e*) The amount of traffic which will reach Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues will not be in excess of the capacity of those intersections, and will not tend to increase congestion in the midcity area. Any proposed diversion of traffic from this area will depreciate property values therein.

The most recent expression of opinion by the Planning Commission bases its objection to the two-bridge scheme on the fact that "in the opinion of the Commission it will throw a greater volume of traffic into the downtown section of Washington than is good for the general welfare of the city." With respect to this contention, Mr. McDonald has the following to say: "On the north approach the Maine Avenue grade separation can accommodate three lanes in each direction, and the streets to the north can, or can be made to, distribute this volume easily. Between the bridgehead and the Maine Avenue grade separation considerable traffic will be directed to Fifteenth Street, Seventeenth Street, and East Potomac Park." Traffic studies made between 7 and 9:30 a. m. during June and July 1944, indicate that 29 percent of the traffic entering the District by way of Highway Bridge turns off at Maine Avenue SW., 17 percent at D Street SW., and 10 percent at Independence Avenue SW. Some 2 percent is added at C Street and a small amount at Independence Avenue. Of the total volume which crosses Highway Bridge, only 47 percent moves on Fourteenth Street north of Adams Drive NW. This northbound traffic on Fourteenth Street has a street capacity of three lanes when it reaches Constitution Avenue, and assuming that all four lanes over the bridge are used to full capacity, it is difficult to see how 47 percent of this, or less than two lanes, will congest a street with three-lane capacity.

The question of diverting traffic from the business districts of urban communities by the use of bypass routes has recently been the subject of study by a committee of traffic experts. Briefly, it was their conclusion that "even with a

bypass, a major part of the traffic will continue to flow through the city to the full capacity of the roads leading to it." They further concluded that any action which tends to divert traffic from the business district, for economic or other reasons (as proposed by the Planning Commission), is poor economy as property values will be depreciated more than the yearly cost of constructing adequate transportation facilities. Although the Commissioners cannot agree that the present capacity of the facilities along Fourteenth Street will be overloaded by traffic from the two-bridge scheme, they consider that it would be comparatively simple and more economical to increase that capacity than to build a new river crossing.

The Commissioners realize that this question can result in honest differences of opinion, but should the decision made at this time prove to be erroneous, they alone must accept the responsibility. They are fully convinced that in concurring with the Administrator of Public Roads in respect to traffic engineering, and with the Fine Arts Commission in respect to the esthetic values involved, they have accepted the best possible advice.

(Enclosure 5)

Highway Bridge, 1941, 24-hour traffic

Month	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Month	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday
January	38,383			July	46,353		
February	38,387			August	48,609	48,715	50,099
March	41,134			September	44,753	49,937	50,584
April	45,567	52,728	51,712	October	43,277	48,715	47,859
May	44,568	47,934	47,783	November	44,239	49,147	45,133
June	45,674	49,739	47,321	December	46,918		

Averages

Saturday traffic 109.55 percent of weekday traffic (factor 1.0955).
Sunday traffic 107.52 percent of weekday traffic (factor 1.0752).

(Enclosure 6)

FOURTEENTH STREET TRAFFIC FLOW, AVERAGE WARTIME WEEKDAY, JULY 1944

1. Of the 18,860 vehicles south-bound on Highway Bridge, 5,100, or 27.02 percent turned right around loop to go east on Mount Vernon Boulevard and 1,050, or 5.55 percent, turned right to go west.

2. Of the 7,570 vehicles west-bound on Mount Vernon Boulevard, 4,230, or 55.8 percent, turned right to go north on Highway Bridge—contributing 22.4 percent of the north-bound bridge traffic volume. Only 37.37 percent of the Mount Vernon traffic passed Highway Bridge west-bound.

3. Bypassable traffic north-bound on Highway Bridge originating on U. S. No. 1 south of Alexandria with designation on U. S. No. 1 north of Washington consisted of 530 passenger cars—3.36 percent of 15,786 passenger cars using bridge and 278 trucks, 9.91 percent of 2,805 trucks using bridge—4.35 percent, or 808 vehicles, of total traffic volume were considered bypassable.

4. A traffic count made during July 1944 analyzing traffic flow on Fourteenth Street north-bound from Highway Bridge to Pennsylvania Avenue furnishes the following facts of interest:

(*a*) Total north-bound volume, Highway Bridge, 18,814.

(*b*) A total of 11,860 vehicles turned east between bridge and including Independence Avenue (63 percent of bridge volume), with 722 turning west. Two thousand five hundred and sixty-nine vehicles from the east flowed into north on Fourteenth Street and 831 from the west to north on Fourteenth Street. In other words, a net loss of 9,182 vehicles at center line of Independence Avenue—45 percent net loss in bridge volume.

(*c*) Five thousand three hundred and sixty-two vehicles turned east at Maine Avenue—28.9 percent of bridge volume. Little in traffic south of Maine Avenue turned off. Three thousand eight hundred and eighty vehicles turned east at D Street—17 percent of bridge volume. Five hundred and forty-one at C Street east. Two thousand three hundred and ninety vehicles turned east at Independence Avenue—12.7 percent of bridge volume.

(*d*) Traffic volume—north-bound, 14th St.:

	Vehicles
Highway Bridge	18, 814
Tidal Basin	19, 160
South of D St	15, 175
South of C St	12, 374
South of Independence Ave	12, 729
South of Constitution Ave	10, 002
South of E St	9, 511
South of Pennsylvania Ave. (31 percent of bridge volume)	6, 776

(*c*) Turning movements in and out from and to north-bound flow between bridge and south of Pennsylvania Ave.:

Out to east	17, 112	
Out to west	3, 476	
Total out		[1] 20, 588
In from east	5, 691	
In from west	2, 858	
Total in		8, 549
Net loss to north-bound between Highway Bridge and south of Pennsylvania Ave		12, 039

[1] It is reasonable to assume that a good part of this traffic would use the Park Road system when proper connections are made as proposed by this plan—say 2,500 vehicles, thereby reducing the 14th St. flow.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., November 29, 1944.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LEA: This refers to the request of your committee for a report on H. R. 5511 entitled "A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes."

I recommend that H. R. 5511 be not enacted.

The primary purpose of this bill is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges across the Potomac River to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge and to require the Federal agencies having control and jurisdiction over the lands at and adjacent to the ends of the bridges to transfer such lands to the Commissioners, at their request, for the construction of the bridges, approaches, and connecting roads in accordance with the plans approved by the Commissioners and the Public Roads Administration.

I concur in the recommendation of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for a single six-lane bridge and in the objections of that Commission to the construction of two four-lane bridges since such objections are based upon sound economy and modern city planning. Furthermore, I am convinced that the construction of two bridges would do violence to the appearance of this important point of entry into the Nation's Capital. The proposed legislation, if enacted, also would grant to the Commissioners exclusive authority to use, for construction and other purposes, certain park lands and roads now administered by this Department.

The Federal Government recently finished the Jefferson Memorial at a cost of $3,000,000. An integral and important part of the Memorial is its setting. Of that setting, no element is of greater importance than the trees which provide its background when viewed from across the Tidal Basin or from the White House. If the Commissioners' two-bridge proposal were undertaken, this background of foliage would have to be removed to make way for the embankment across which the north-bound vehicles would leave the bridge that would carry that traffic. Any replacement of those trees would cut off the north-bound traveler's near view of the Memorial, therefore, it is safe to predict that such replacement would never be undertaken. In that case, the background of the Memorial, particularly as

viewed from the south portal and the White House, would have the highway embankment and the railroad bridge as two of its most conspicuous elements.

I am convinced that the single-bridge proposal advocated by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, with its 18 years of experience in maintaining a comprehensive, consistent, and coordinated plan for the District of Columbia and its environs, is definitely preferable to the two-bridge proposal urged by the Commissioners. The Commission's proposal contemplates the erection, south of the Jefferson Memorial, of a single six-lane bridge. The construction of this bridge would involve much less interference, and for a much shorter period, with traffic and park lands than would be the case with the two-bridge plan. The single bridge would provide a traffic capacity about double that of the present four-lane bridge and should be sufficient to meet all traffic requirements that might develop for crossing the river at this point to the extent, at least, that such traffic should be fed into or out of the downtown portion of the city. On the other hand, if the two bridges with eight lanes of traffic were utilized to full capacity, it would result in a vastly increased traffic load on the already congested downtown streets and would in turn necessitate major and costly provisions for express traffic throughout the downtown area.

The north end of the bridge, advocated by the Park and Planning Commission, would be placed just to the west of the end of the Fourteenth Street Highway Bridge and would diverge from it sufficiently to permit the operation of the swing span in the Highway Bridge, which bridge would be removed as soon as the new bridge could be put into service. The center line would center exactly upon the Jefferson Memorial, thus providing, directly ahead of the traveler from the south, a view of the Memorial that would be a most impressive introduction to the National Capital.

From the esthetic viewpoint, the single bridge, focused on the Jefferson Memorial, and placed as far away from the railroad bridge as possible, with no interference with the lovely background of the Memorial would, in my opinion, be greatly preferred to the two-bridge proposal. This opinion also is shared by Frederick Law Olmsted, who planned the surroundings of the Memorial and whose judgment in this matter further confirms the position taken by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in favor of a single bridge.

Sooner or later, another bridge should be constructed crossing the Potomac River at Alexandria. This bridge would provide a bypass for those passenger vehicles and trucks which did not have occasion to enter downtown Washington and which would use the route along the east side of the Anacostia River and the authorized South Capitol Street Bridge. Such a bridge would provide a more direct approach from the south to the geographical center and eastern parts of the city, and would also provide for fuller use of the proposed new South Capitol Street Bridge and the street system of the eastern part of the city now relatively little used.

There is still another serious objection to the constructon of two four-lane bridges. Investigation has disclosed that, although the discharge of the Potomac River in the 1942 flood was 10 percent less than the discharge for the 1936 flood, the height of the water over the Potomac Park area was 1.5 feet higher in 1942 than in 1936. At the District line (upstream), the extreme height of the water in 1942 was 2 feet less than in 1936, yet the 1.5 feet higher water in the Potomac Park area covered more than twice the area in 1942 than was covered in 1936. The cause of this high water in the Potomac Park area is believed to have been due to the temporary bridges in the Potomac River at that time. Since the 1942 flood, the number of piers supporting the railroad bridge has been increased to twice the number that existed at that time, and the placing of two bridges in this area would increase the number of permanent piers in the river to twice as many as existed during the 1942 flood. The obstruction to the free flow of water thus would be comparable to, if not greater than, the obstruction caused by the temporary structures in the Potomac River opposite Potomac Park.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that the National Park Service, with the concurrence of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, has the authority without additional legislation to transfer to the District of Columbia whatever land is required for bridge purposes. Therefore, I am strongly opposed to any legislation which would give another public agency complete freedom in the selection and use of park lands that are now administered by this Department.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the presentation of the views contained in this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK
AND PLANNING COMMISSION,
INTERIOR BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1944.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LEA: 1. In reply to your letter of November 22, 1944, although there is no question as to the need for replacing the present Highway Bridge as soon as possible, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission recommends against the enactment of H. R. 5511, for the following reasons:

(*a*) It would authorize reconstruction of the Fourteenth Street Highway Bridge in a manner involving the unnecessary expenditure of between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000 at this time.

(*b*) It would provide a bridge capacity not only unnecessary in the foreseeable future, but also actually harmful to the National Capital, in that it would inevitably induce a flow of traffic into the congested part of the city which the existing street system cannot absorb, thereby adding to the present interference with both private and government business resulting from the traffic congestion already existing therein.

(*c*) In order to help carry the traffic from the bridge, it will obviously be necessary to build a tunnel under Fourteenth Street, which has recently been estimated to cost $10,500,000. This expenditure can be saved if the recommendations of this Commission are followed.

(*d*) By increasing flood heights, destroying the background of the Jefferson Memorial, and other collateral effects, it would unnecessarily do material damage to an important central feature of the National Capital in which the Federal Government has an investment of several millions of dollars.

2. As the Commission bases its opinion on an analysis of traffic conditions on Fourteenth Street and on its intersecting park roads and streets, and in the central congested area of the city, which cannot be briefly explained in a letter, I request an opportunity to present these facts and conclusions in person to your committee. The situation as it appears to this Commission is summarized in the following paragraphs.

3. With a background of nearly 20 years' experience in the planning and development of Washington during a period of phenomenal growth, comprising the unusual conditions of both the great depression and the present World War, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission recommends a single six-lane bridge as against the two four-lane bridges favored by the Commissioner of Public Roads and the District Commissioners, for the following reasons:

(a) Its capacity will be approximately 4,000 vehicles an hour each way, or more than double the maximum recorded peak-hour traffic volume over the existing highway bridge. This checks substantially with the capacity actually developed on the six-lane Philadelphia-Camden bridge.

(*b*) This capacity will be adequate to meet any demand that can be reasonably forecast, and will equal or slightly exceed the volume that can be passed through the critical intersections controlling the Washington approaches.

(*c*) To facilitate the flow of more than six lanes of traffic into the central, congested area will not only intensify the present unbalanced circulation of traffic therein, but will do irreparable harm to the heart of the city where traffic congestion has already reached an intensity inconsistent with its best interests. Washington must seek ways of reducing this central congestion, as other cities are doing, rather than to add to it, if values in the central business district are to be maintained and governmental activities are not to be impaired.

(*d*) Obviously Fourteenth Street with six traffic lanes, two of which are occupied by streetcars, and with frequent street crossings on grade, cannot carry even the full traffic volume delivered by six bridge lanes uninterrupted for nearly half a mile. Careful check of peak traffic at various critical intersections shows conclusively that the park roads and streets crossing Fourteenth Street cannot handle the surplus traffic of eight bridge lanes to and from the north.

(*e*) The capacity of the central-area street system cannot be further expanded appreciably without extravagantly expensive constructions and injury to established governmental and commercial economy.

(*f*) The single six-lane bridge will cost only about two-thirds as much as two four-lane bridges (a saving of between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000) and in addition it will save the much higher cost of remedies, such as a Fourteenth Street tunnel

recently estimated at $10,500,000 that will be necessary to help absorb the overburden of traffic which would be brought in by the eight bridge lanes.

4. The Highway Bridge at Fourteenth Street is the last bridge across the Potomac River for 40 miles downstream. It therefore carries both local traffic and north-south coastwise traffic. This through traffic has no business in the congested central area of Washington. As a matter of sound city planning, the Planning Commission has recommended another bridge just north of Alexandria to carry the through traffic and the local traffic from Alexandria and points south destined for the geographical center and eastern parts of the city, via the Anacostia road system and the South Capitol Street Bridge. Such a bridge will not only bypass the congested Federal and business center and relieve the Fourteenth Street Bridge of some traffic not destined for the congested area, but will also put to fuller use the South Capitol Street Bridge and the eastern street system now relatively little used.

5. With the single 6-lane bridge, the Washington metropolitan area's 1,250,000 inhabitants will have an aggregate of 19 bridge lanes across the Potomac, whereas New York with some 7,500,000 inhabitants is served by 16 bridge and tunnel lanes across the Hudson, and the Philadelphia-Camden area with nearly 3,000,000 inhabitants is served by 10 bridge lanes across the Delaware.

6. In recommending the two four-lane bridges the District Commissioners are following the advice of their Director of Highways and of the United States Commissioner of Public Roads. It is noteworthy that their advice in this case appears to be inconsistent with their views previously expressed, although there has been no change in the facts or in the statistics on which their changed views are now based.

7. On April 17, 1941, in connection with the remodeling of the Fourteenth Street-Maine Avenue crossing, the District Director of Highways assured this Commission that it was physically impossible to develop eight traffic lanes on Fourteenth Street at this bottleneck. When his attention was called to the fact that a six-lane bridge with uninterrupted traffic for a considerable distance would provide traffic capacity in excess of that of the six lanes of Fourteenth Street with its interruptions to traffic, he emphasized the necessity for getting the through traffic off Fourteenth Street and keeping it out of the center of the city. He also pointed out that Constitution Avenue with a flow of 62,000 vehicles an hour could not take any more traffic and that the Seventeenth Street crossing of Constitution Avenue could not take any more either. These statements are entirely in accord with the analyses of the traffic data made by this Commission and inconsistent with the views now being urged, although the basic data are still the same.

8. In its very able report on interregional highways (H. Doc. No. 379, 78th Cong.) the National Interregional Highway Committee, of which Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald was chairman, discusses at length (pp. 53–77) and warns against the dangers of bringing unassorted interregional traffic into the congested heart of a large city as this project proposes to do; it clearly indicates such traffic should first be distributed or at most carried tangent to the congested district (fig. 31, p. 72 and p. 81).

9. Attention is invited to the fact that the recommendations of this Commission for a single six-lane bridge at Fourteenth Street now, and a bridge at Alexandria later for the through coastal traffic and for traffic destined to the southern, eastern, and northeastern parts of the city, if and when needed, is not only in accord with the best recognized city-planning practice, but also with the recommendations of the said Interregional Highway Committee (pp. 76–77). In the Planning Commission's opinion the bridge at Alexandria will become necessary in any case.

10. In 1941 a very thorough investigation of the bridge situation was made by Sverdrup & Parcel, consulting engineers, for the War Department. The following quotation from this report is pertinent and important:

The essential points of this report may be summarized as follows:

(1) The very thorough study of highway traffic in the Washington area presented in the special report of the Director of Highways of the District of Columbia indicates that (*a*) a vehicular crossing at Alexandria to relieve the congestion on the Fourteenth Street Bridge and (more particularly) the city streets leading to it is a present necessity, and that (*b*) a reconstruction of the Fourteenth Street Bridge and a revision of the approach roads, to increase traffic capacity, may become a necessity in the reasonably near future.

* * * * * * *

The estimates of cost based on the above studies are as follows:

At 14th Street: 6-lane highway bridge and approaches, 72-foot roadway and two 8-foot sidewalks, total width, 92 feet	$4, 694, 000
* * * * * * *	*
At Alexandria: 4-lane highway bridge and approaches, 48-foot roadway, and two 8-foot sidewalks, total width, 68 feet	3, 810, 000
Total	8, 504, 000

11. From the foregoing it will be seen that these consulting engineers for the War Department, after thorough study of the District's traffic data, recommended a single 6-lane bridge at Fourteenth Street and a 4-lane bridge at Alexandria—just the recommendation now made by the Planning Commission. This will provide 10 lanes, properly distributed, at a cost of only $1,500,000 more than for 8 lanes at one point, erroneously so located as to involve future expenditures amounting to many millions.

12. Since the submission of the above report to the War Department, the approaches on the Virginia shore have been improved and are ample for a six-lane bridge, probably adequate for the proposed eight lanes. The approaches on the Washington shore have also been improved at great expense, but are barely adequate for the six-lane bridge. They are not adequate for the two four-lane bridges and, according to the District Director of Highways' statement referred to in paragraph 7 above, they cannot be further enlarged, except of course by construction of a tunnel under Fourteenth Street estimated to cost $10,500,000. Besides its cost, such a tunnel is believed to be inconsistent with the city's best interests and is certainly not needed now if the new bridge is properly designed.

13. It is not known what experts have advised the Commissioner of Public Roads and the District Commissioners, but it seems evident that such advice has come from experts in road traffic, not experts in city planning, and that they have been concerned solely with providing more than enough traffic capacity on the bridge, without due regard to the harmful effect on the city of inducing too much traffic into the congested area. Of this over-all city planning question, the Planning Commission believes itself to be more experienced and better qualified than the traffic experts.

14. Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted, a landscape architect and city planner of Nation-wide reputation, a member of the 1901 MacMillan Commission, for many years a member of the Commission of Fine Arts and for 12 years a member of the Park and Planning Commission, made a thorough study for the National Park Service of the effect of the proposed twin-bridge project on the Jefferson Memorial and its setting. The Commission of Fine Arts' approval of the twin-bridge project, in the face of Mr. Olmsted's report as to its adverse effects upon the Jefferson Memorial setting, is difficult to understand. The Planning Commission has visited the various critical points of view and many of its members have, after careful consideration on the ground, agreed with Mr. Olmsted; though this being more a question of esthetics than of city planning, the Planning Commission has taken no formal action on the matter.

15. It is understood that the Secretary of the Interior or the National Park Service will inform your committee fully on this subject and also on the other harmful effects on the Potomac Park system.

16. The Planning Commission's original recommendations with the reasons therefor are contained in the executive officer's letter of March 7, 1944, copy of which is enclosed.

17. The above proposed report was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget containing the following statement as to the attitude of the Bureau of the Budget, "I am advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the foregoing is not inconsistent with the President's policy." Attached is the reply of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which states fully the attitude of the Bureau of the Budget on this proposed legislation and on this report.

Sincerely yours,

U. S. Grant 3d,
Major General, U. S. Army,
Chairman.

(Enclosure A)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., December 5, 1944.

Hon. U. S. GRANT 3d,
Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL GRANT: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of November 27, 1944, transmitting the original and one copy of a proposed adverse report to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, relative to H. R. 5511, a bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

In my letter of October 4, 1944, I advised you that the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia had submitted a draft of bill proposing the construction of two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street Bridge, which draft of bill is in the form that has now been introduced as H. R. 5511; that the Federal Works Agency also favored the enactment of such legislation; and that I had advised both agencies that there would be no objection to the submission to the Congress of the proposed legislation and of their favorable recommendations with respect thereto. I also advised you and the Secretary of the Interior that there would be no objection to the submission to the appropriate committees of Congress by you and the Secretary of reports opposed to the enactment of the proposed legislation.

In other words, I felt that the views of the four agencies concerned with this matter should be submitted for the consideration of the congressional committees without any accompanying statement as to the relation of the legislation to the program of the President.

Since the advice previously given you with respect to the draft of bill is equally applicable to that draft in its present form, H. R. 5511, you are advised that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed report on H. R. 5511, which accompanied your letter of November 27, 1944, provided the last paragraph thereof be revised to indicate that you had been advised by this Office that your report on the bill should not be considered as involving any commitment with respect to the relation of the proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH, *Director.*

(Enclosure B)

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 8, 1944.

Mr. A. E. DEMARAY,
Acting Executive Officer, National Capital
Park and Planning Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DEMARAY: I have your letter of March 7 advising that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission has reaffirmed its previously expressed preference for a single six-lane highway bridge to replace the present Highway Bridge across the Potomac River.

Your letter and the accompanying map have been carefully studied. We are sympathetic to the Commission's desire to "induce a better distribution of and interrelationship between the residential population and the business and employment centers in the National Capital," but we fail to see how this can be accomplished by limiting the capacity of a Potomac River crossing so that it is not definitely adequate to meet probable traffic volumes and by choosing a design which does not fit the observed traffic-turning movements. In my letter of January 12 to General Grant, you were given the results of the very thorough analysis made by traffic engineers of wide experience, and the figures for probable traffic and percentage of left-turning vehicles lead to the conclusion that the crossing should be designed with two bridges, several hundred feet apart, one for each direction of travel, each to be designed four lanes wide. On the same basis,

a single bridge six lanes wide would not be safely adequate and would fail to fully develop the capacity already constructed on both approaches.

I think it axiomatic that a crossing as important as that over the Potomac River at the Nation's Capital should be designed to serve adequately the probable traffic volume and traffic pattern. To provide an inadequate facility with the thought that the overload would sooner compel the building of a bridge at Alexandria goes contrary to all observed traffic history. It is neither sound design nor good city planning.

We cannot agree that the completion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway will reduce appreciably traffic from the south on the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway. The latter is an excellent parkway facility, protected for all time from serious encroachment. It is the most direct route for passenger vehicles from the heart of Alexandria. Traffic diverted to the Shirley Highway will more than be made up by the expansion of housing near the Mount Vernon Highway. On the contrary, I look to the eventual increase in the width of the Mount Vernon Highway between Washington and Alexandria to six lanes, in accordance with the original design.

You question my statement that the Pentagon network is designed for three through traffic lanes in each direction by calling attention to the fact that bridge No. 21 is constructed without added width for acceleration and deceleration. A call to any one of several men on our staff would have enabled you to learn why this bridge was not constructed as wide as the others. Be assured that the capacity of the Pentagon network approach to Highway Bridge is three full lanes in each direction.

Comparative cost of two designs becomes pertinent only after it is determined that both designs are functionally competent. Two separate one-way bridges would cost slightly more than a single two-way bridge with the same number of traffic lanes, but a comparison of structure costs only is not sufficient. If approaches also are considered, as they must be, the total cost for the two-bridge plan would, in my judgment, be less than the total cost, including demolition and replacement of existing structures, of a one-bridge scheme of equal capacity.

You again refer to Mr. Olmstead's report at the November meeting regarding the impact of the two-bridge plan on the Jefferson Memorial and West Potomac Park. This report was given serious consideration, not alone but in conjunction with the judgment of others fully competent to judge of the amenities. The predominant opinion favors the two-bridge plan. I am keenly sensitive of the effects of any construction on the National Capital, particularly that required to meet the increasing needs of motor-vehicle travel. The protection of the Arlington National Cemetery and its connection with the Lincoln Memorial from commercial traffic held a place of importance in my thinking when I advocated a long-time adequacy for the Fourteenth Street crossing. The reasons are given in my letter to General Grant.

Sound city planning calls for visualizing the future to the end so well stated in your letter, but city planners are conscious of their inability to wholly control the development of a city and to see precisely all future requirements. It is necessary, therefore, that a plan and its component parts have flexibilty, so that they can be bent and adjusted to fit changing future needs. A crossing of the Potomac River and its approaches, in keeping with this principle, should have high capacity and be so arranged that it will permit full and continuous movement of all through and turning traffic even though the pattern may change appreciably at different times. These requirements, in my considered judgment, are met by the plan calling for two one-way bridges, each four lanes wide, one a few hundred feet downstream from the other, and are not satisfied by one two-way bridge six lanes wide.

I believe the several exchanges of letters and our attendance at meetings of your Commission have covered the ground thoroughly and that further conferences are unnecessary. If, however, your Commission feels that it has further pertinent data to offer, or if it feels that a further conference will help it to a greater familiarity with the data and analysis thereof that brought us to our conclusion, Deputy Commissioner Hilts will, upon request from you, make the necessary arrangements.

The Commission's interest in all highway problems in the area and your keeping me informed of its conclusions are greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

THOS. H. MACDONALD,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

REQUEST FOR REINTRODUCTION IN SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., December 29, 1944.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RAYBURN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit for reintroduction the bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes, which was introduced during the Seventy-eighth Congress as H. R. 5511.

Section 1 of the bill authorizes and directs the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges across the Potomac River to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge, together with approaches and connecting roads, the south-bound bridge to be constructed as nearly as practicable in the location of the existing bridge and the north-bound bridge to be constructed within 600 feet of the downstream side of the present bridge, all at a cost not to exceed $7,000,000.

Section 2 provides that the Federal agencies having control and jurisdiction over the lands at and adjacent to the ends of the bridges shall transfer to the Commissioners, at their request, the lands necessary for the construction of the bridges, approaches, and connecting roads, in accordance with plans approved by the Commissioners and the Public Roads Administration.

Section 3 authorizes the Commissioners to acquire by purchase or condemnation all lands in Virginia not under Federal jurisdiction or control which are necessary to completion of the project, title to be taken in the name of the United States, and provides that jurisdiction and control over lands acquired under the bill shall be transferred to the District of Columbia.

Section 4 authorizes the Commissioners to make such use of federally owned and controlled lands at the ends of the proposed bridges as may be necessary for preliminary work, storage of materials, and construction of the bridges.

Section 5 authorizes and directs the Commissioners to route and reroute traffic on or close connecting roads under Federal jurisdiction and to negotiate with the Virginia authorities for closing of roads, when necessary, in connection with the preparation of plans for and actual construction of the bridges, approaches, and connecting roads. It further authorizes the Commissioners to prepare plans for changes in park roads when necessary in the interest of maximum efficiency in handling traffic to and from the bridges, and, on approval of the Public Roads Administration, to construct roads in conformity with such plans.

Section 6 provides for cooperation of the National Capital Park Service and the Commissioners in the regrading and landscaping of areas involved in the construction of the proposed bridges, the regrading to be done by the Commissioners to conform with plans approved by them and the Public Roads Administration, and the landscaping to be done by the National Capital Park Service in accordance with plans prepared by them and approved by the Commissioners and the Public Roads Administration.

Section 7 provides that construction, reconstruction, and repair of all roads which are changed or made necessary incident to the construction of the bridges, approaches, and connecting roads shall be paid for out of the funds made available for construction of the bridges, approaches, and connecting roads.

The present bridge is located on United States Highway No. 1, the most heavily traveled route into and out of the District of Columbia to and from the north and south. Traffic counts made immediately prior to the war indicated an average daily use in the summer season of approximately 47,000 vehicles per day, of which approximately 18 percent were trucks. The narrow lanes, particularly with the heavy truck traffic present, have been the indirect cause of many accidents, due primarily to sideswiping. On numerous occasions heavy trucks have run into the supporting members of the overhead trusses.

The existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge, a four-lane, restricted-capacity structure, was erected in 1903. While the bridge is physically safe, it is not capable of carrying the present traffic volume without undue congestion and delay which reflects itself upon a substantial part of the District of Columbia traffic system. The bridge is not in the best physical condition. Two-thirds of the flooring system is of laminated wood construction, which is in the process of decay. Two or more of the piers are badly scoured, with the pile foundation partially exposed.

The bridges authorized by this bill, as previously stated, are two in number, with four lanes each. The proposed bridges are designed so as to provide not only for anticipated postwar flow but to adequately serve traffic demands for a reasonable period thereafter. The new bridges will more adequately care for the turning movement of traffic, particularly movements to and from the Mount Vernon Boulevard.

Before submission to the Seventy-eighth Congress, the proposed draft was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and returned to the Commissioners with the advice that there was no objection on the part of that office to presentation of the bill to the Congress.

Respectfully,

JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

REPORTS ON H. R. 541, IN THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, May 15, 1945.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LEA: Careful consideration has been given to the bill H. R. 541, transmitted with your letter of April 27, with request for a report thereon.

This bill would authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River. In view of the interests of the Federal Works Agency in the proposed crossing and the objections raised by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, I feel it is desirable to set forth our reasons for recommending approval of the plan proposed by the bill.

The existing bridge is in very poor condition and will need replacement at an early date. Examination by divers indicates severe scour at some of the piers. The deck, part of which is of timber, needs frequent replacement, and the machinery of the drawspan is worn to a degree that makes its continued operation uncertain. The District Commissioners initiate projects for highway improvements in the District of Columbia, are responsible for the location and design of all streets and highways and their effect on the development of the city, and make final decisions in line with their responsibility. Anticipating Federal participation in the cost of replacing existing Highway Bridge they called the Public Roads Administration in for advice and, consonant with their general policy, sought the advice and counsel of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts.

A detailed study of traffic was made, its probable growth, its pattern, and its distribution. A new major bridge over the Potomac River will be a structure as nearly permanent as economically feasible, with an estimated life of probably more than 50 years. The investment therein would be ill-advised if it were not adequate for traffic at least 20 years hence. In 20 years the traffic in both directions may exceed 90,000 vehicles per day; and, what is more important as an index of needed capacity, the peak-hour traffic in one direction will be more than 6,000 vehicles. The approaches were studied for the purpose of determining their capacities and their ability to handle the estimated traffic volume between the bridge and the road system in Arlington on the south and the street system in the District on the north and with a view of destroying as little of recently constructed facilities as feasible. These studies showed that a single two-way bridge with its necessary loop turns for the great number of left-turning vehicles at the bridgeheads would be inadequate and forced the conclusion that it was necessary to provide two one-way bridges, each to carry traffic in one direction, each four lanes wide, and one a few hundred feet downstream from the other, so that direct paths could be provided for left-turning vehicles. This plan has numerous additional advantages over a single-bridge scheme.

The National Capital Park and Planning Commission stresses the thought that the volume of traffic which can be accommodated by the structure as proposed will overload the streets in the District of Columbia, thus forcing additional expenditure for relief, particularly on Fourteenth Street. This thought is not in agreement with traffic facts. Measurements of traffic volumes on Fourteenth Street indicate that at the present time about one-fourth of the traffic crossing

Highway Bridge turns off at Maine Avenue, and that despite additions to the traffic stream from the several cross streets, the volume approaching Constitution Avenue is only about one-half and that approaching Pennsylvania Avenue is about one-third of that crossing Highway Bridge. When streets now partially improved are extended in accordance with approved plans additional dispersal of traffic can be expected. A single bridge six lanes wide would be wholly inadequate and not at all equal to the capacities of the approaches. At the present time in both Virginia and the District, except for short sections of highway immediately adjoining the bridge, the road and street systems feeding the bridge have a discharge capacity well above that of a bridge providing four lanes for traffic in each direction.

The Commission of Fine Arts has unanimously approved the plan to provide two one-way bridges. Its members carefully considered the objections raised by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to the two-bridge plan on grounds of its relation to the Jefferson Memorial, and took the view that the two bridges would be esthetically superior to a single wide bridge.

On a single two-way bridge, whether of six- or eight-lane design, passenger vehicles approaching Washington from the south would necessarily be driven between a line of trucks which generally would occupy the outside lane on the right and all traffic moving in the opposite direction would be on the left. Such a condition would certainly preclude a relaxed enjoyment of either the immediate surroundings or the unfolding view ahead. In contrast, drivers and occupants of north-bound vehicles on a one-way bridge would look to the left over an open rail and see the bridge for south-bound traffic beyond an expanse of water, the Memorial Bridge in the distance, and the Jefferson Memorial and Washington Monument through and over the trees on the Washington side of the river.

Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant 3d, as Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, has written Commissioner Thomas H. MacDonald on several occasions outlining his objections to the proposed plan from the standpoint of city planning for the District and has suggested the adoption of a single bridge, six lanes wide, located to clear the existing draw span on the north. These were given serious consideration, but the conclusion reached was that neither traffic nor the interests of the District would be served by a bridge which soon would be unable to accommodate the traffic that would inevitably use the structure. The highway administrator in an urban area must and does consider city planning as a prime factor in his determinations because the location and design of arterial routes in cities can favorably or adversely affect the city's stabilization or development. However, when it was decided that an adequate crossing of the Potomac River should be provided in the general vicinity of the existing bridge it then became a design responsibility. We are in full agreement with the District Commissioners that the design requirements have been satisfied in all respects and in an outstanding manner.

This Agency, therefore, recommends favorable action on the bill.

This report has been referred to the Bureau of the Budget. That Bureau has advised that there would be no objection to its submission to the committee, but without commitment thereby as to relationship to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General, United States Army,
Administrator.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, May 7, 1945.

HON. VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It has been brought to the attention of this Commission that a hearing will be held on May 11, 1945, on the subject of a bill (H. R. 541) authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street Bridge across the Potomac River and for other purposes.

The Commission of Fine Arts have followed with especial interest the progress of the painstaking studies by engineers representing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia resulting in a recommendation to construct two bridges situated approximately 500 feet apart to replace the existing Fourteenth Street Bridge crossing the Potomac River. This Commission are glad to give unqualified and enthusiastic approval to the plans for constructing two bridges, one on

the site of the present structure for traffic moving in a westerly direction, and the other, situated about 500 feet south of the first structure and midway between it and the existing railroad bridge, for traffic moving in an easterly direction.

Representatives of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia conferred with the Commission of Fine Arts frequently during the progress of their studies which led to an anonymous competition among several outstanding firms of engineers and architects, and which resulted in the selection of designs by Howard, Needles, Tammen & Bergendoff, engineers, of Kansas City, and Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch & Abbot, architects, of Boston. The designs for two bridges prepared by these firms were placed first by this Commission and in this choice the Commissioners of the District of Columbia subsequently concurred.

This Commission attended a number of meetings of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and listened to long discussions and read reports by representatives of that body in support of a scheme for a single-bridge crossing of the Potomac. Nothing these advocates of the single-bridge scheme had to offer has changed our opinion that two bridges are necessary from the standpoint of adequately serving the needs of traffic for the next 50 years. And it is our considered judgment that esthetically two bridges will be eminently more satisfactory—in fact two reasonably narrow structures will be much handsomer than one wide structure.

We urge, therefore, the approval of the two-bridge scheme, as provided in H. R. 541, for we believe that its advocates, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Public Roads Administration, are the most competent agencies to decide upon a practicable scheme for a crossing of the Potomac River at Fourteenth Street.

Very respectfully,

GILMORE D. CLARKE, *Chairman*
(For the Commission of Fine Arts).

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1945.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LEA: This refers to the request of your committee for a report on H. R. 541, entitled "A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes."

The subject matter of H. R. 541 is identical with that contained in H. R. 5511, which was introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress. Therefore, H. R. 541 is objectionable, for the same reasons which were advanced by me in my report of November 29, 1944, to your committee on H. R. 5511.

I recommend that H. R. 541 be not enacted.

The primary purpose of this bill is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges across the Potomac River to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge and to require the Federal agencies having control and jurisdiction over the lands at and adjacent to the ends of the bridges to transfer such lands to the Commissioners, at their request, for the construction of the bridges, approaches, and connecting roads in accordance with the plans approved by the Commissioners and the Public Roads Administration.

I concur in the recommendation of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for a single six-lane bridge and in the objections of that Commission to the construction of two four-lane bridges, since such objections are based upon sound economy and modern city planning. Furthermore, I am convinced that the construction of two bridges would do violence to the appearance of this important point of entry into the Nation's Capital. The proposed legislation, if enacted, also would grant to the Commissioners exclusive authority to use, for construction and other purposes, certain park lands and roads now administered by this Department.

The Federal Government recently finished the Jefferson Memorial at a cost of $3,000,000. An integral and important part of the memorial is its setting. Of that setting, no element is of greater importance than the trees which provide its background when viewed from across the Tidal Basin or from the White House. If the Commissioners' two-bridge proposal were undertaken, this background of

foliage would have to be removed to make way for the embankment across which the north-bound vehicles would leave the bridge that would carry that traffic. Any replacement of those trees would cut off the north-bound traveler's near view of the memorial, therefore it is safe to predict that such replacement would never be undertaken. In that case, the background of the memorial, particularly as viewed from the south portal and the White House, would have the highway embankment and the railroad bridge as two of its most conspicuous elements.

I am convinced that the single-bridge proposal advocated by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, with its 18 years of experience in maintaining a comprehensive, consistent, and coordinated plan for the District of Columbia and its environs, is definitely preferable to the two-bridge proposal urged by the Commissioners. The Commission's proposal contemplates the erection, south of the Jefferson Memorial, of a single six-lane bridge. The construction of this bridge would involve much less interference, and for a much shorter period, with traffic and park lands than would be the case with the two-bridge plan. The single bridge would provide a traffic capacity about double that of the present four-lane bridge and should be sufficient to meet all traffic requirements that might develop for crossing the river at this point to the extent, at least, that such traffic should be fed into or out of the downtown portion of the city. On the other hand, if the two bridges with eight lines of traffic were utilized to full capacity, it would result in a vastly increased traffic load on the already congested downtown streets and would, in turn, necessitate major and costly provisions for express traffic throughout the downtown area.

The north end of the bridge, advocated by the Park and Planning Commission, would be placed just to the west of the end of the Fourteenth Street Highway Bridge and would diverge from it sufficiently to permit the operation of the swing span in the Highway Bridge, which bridge would be removed as soon as the new bridge could be put into service. The center line would center exactly upon the Jefferson Memorial, thus providing, directly ahead of the traveler from the south, a view of the Memorial that would be a most impressive introduction to the National Capital.

From the esthetic viewpoint, the single bridge, focused on the Jefferson Memorial and placed as far away from the railroad bridge as possible, with no interference with the lovely background of the memorial, would, in my opinion, be greatly preferred to the two-bridge proposal. This opinion also is shared by Frederick Law Olmsted, who planned the surroundings of the memorial and whose judgment in this matter further confirms the position taken by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in favor of a single bridge.

Sooner or later, another bridge should be constructed crossing the Potomac River at Alexandria. This bridge would provide a bypass for those passenger vehicles and trucks which did not have occasion to enter downtown Washington and which would use the route along the east side of the Anacostia River and the authorized South Capitol Street Bridge. Such a bridge would provide a more direct approach from the south to the geographical center and eastern parts of the city and would also provide for fuller use of the proposed new South Capitol Street Bridge and the street system of the eastern part of the city now relatively little used.

There is still another serious objection to the construction of two four-lane bridges. Investigation has disclosed that although the discharge of the Potomac River in the 1942 flood was 10 percent less than the discharge for the 1936 flood, the height of the water over the Potomac Park area was 1.5 feet higher in 1942 than in 1936. At the District line (upstream), the extreme height of the water in 1942 was 2 feet less than in 1936, yet the 1.5 feet higher water in the Potomac Park area covered more than twice the area in 1942 than was covered in 1936. The cause of this high water in the Potomac Park area is believed to have been due to the temporary bridges in the Potomac River at that time. Since the 1942 flood, the number of piers supporting the railroad bridge has been increased to twice the number that existed at that time, and the placing of two bridges in this area would increase the number of permanent piers in the river to twice as many as existed during the 1942 flood. The obstruction to the free flow of water thus would be comparable to, if not greater than, the obstruction caused by the temporary structures in the Potomac River opposite Potomac Park.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that the National Park Service, with the concurrence of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, has the authority without additional legislation to transfer to the District of Columbia

whatever land is required for bridge purposes. Therefore, I am strongly opposed to any legislation which would give another public agency complete freedom in the selection and use of park lands that are now administered by this Department.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me, in connection with the similar report submitted on H. R. 5511, that there is no objection to the presentation of the foregoing views to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

○

Extract from
Congressional Record-House

Page 8375-8376 July 3, 1946.

TWO FOUR-LANE BRIDGES ACROSS THE POTOMAC RIVER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 541) authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee to make an explanation of this legislation to the House.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the then chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Randolph), upon request of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

A subcommittee held extensive and exhaustive hearings on this subject. There appeared Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, Chief of the Public Roads Administration, representatives of the Fine Arts Commission, various automobile clubs, and citizens organizations, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Secretary of the Interior, and other capable and wellinformed witnesses. As a result, the committee reported this bill to provide for the

Extract from
Congressional Record-House

Page 8376-8376 July 5, 1962.

TWO FOUR-LANE BRIDGES ACROSS THE POTOMAC RIVER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 941) authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee to make an explanation of this legislation to the House.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the then chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Yandolph), upon request of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

A subcommittee held extensive and exhaustive hearings on this subject. There appeared Mr. Thomas H. Macdonald, Chief of the Public Roads Administration, representatives of the Fine Arts Commission, various automobile clubs, and citizens organizations, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Secretary of the Interior, and other capable and well-informed witnesses. As a result, the committee reported this bill to provide for the

construction of two four-lane free bridges to replace the inadequate and obsolescent Fourteenth Street Bridge. There was brought to the attention of the committee a very definite and urgent need for replacement at the earliest possible date.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. This is a unaminous report from the Subcommittee on Bridges and also the full committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield:

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Why is it necessary to construct two bridges? Why not erect one bridge now, and leave the Fourteenth Street Bridge as it is until eventually you have the funds in hand to construct the second bridge?

Mr. CHAPMAN. As far as the funds are concerned, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the funds are already available. One bridge will be constructed before the Fourteenth Street bridge is torn down; then the other bridge will be constructed.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me there should be more thought of of the cost. Only yesterday the Congress granted an additional $2,000,000 toward the support of the District. It costs the taxpayers back in the district of Pennsylvania to run the District of Columbia. If you have the money appropriated for one bridge and build that bridge, certainly the present Fourteenth Street structure ought to be good for some years to come and there is no reason why with the country in the condition it is, everybody hollering for something back home, costing the taxpayers lots of money and more taxes that we should permit you to tear down the Fourteenth Street Bridge and construct another one in its place

construction of two four-lane free bridges to replace the inadequate and obsolescent Fourteenth Street Bridge. There was brought to the attention of the committee a very definite and urgent need for replacement at the earliest possible date.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. This is a unanimous report from the Subcommittee on Bridges and also the full committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield:

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Why is it necessary to construct two bridges? Why not erect one bridge now, and leave the Fourteenth Street Bridge as it is until eventually you have the funds in hand to construct the second bridge?

Mr. CHAPMAN. As far as the funds are concerned, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the funds are already available. One bridge will be constructed before the Fourteenth Street bridge is torn down; then the other bridge will be constructed.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me there should be more thought of of the cost. Only yesterday the Congress granted an additional $2,000,000 toward the support of the District. It costs the taxpayers back in the district of Pennsylvania to run the District of Columbia. If you have the money appropriated for one bridge and build that bridge, certainly the present Fourteenth Street structure ought to be good for some years to come and there is no reason why with the country in the condition it is, everybody hollering for something back home, costing the taxpayers lots of money and more taxes that we should permit you to tear down the Fourteenth Street Bridge and construct another one in its place

when it is good for service for years to come.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania had taken time to read the hearings that were held and which were printed several months ago on this subject. If he had I am sure he would not make such statements.

Mr. RICH. I do not know what the hearings disclose. I have seen so many unwise things done here in the District of Columbia. Take for instance the underpass at Sixteenth Street, constructed perpendicular to the one at Fourteenth Street. As long as you hive here, you will rue doing such a ridiculous thing. It blocks an underway from Ninth Street to Twenty-fifth Street or further up Massachusetts Avenue as it should be, but you blocked such a sound plan as that.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Evidently the gentleman has not read the hearings and does not know what information was before the committee.

Mr. RICH. It siims to me that instead of tearing down the Fourteenth Street Bridge it should be permitted to remain intact and in use until the country gets on its feet.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The statements he has just made inicat the intent of this legislation. We are going to build a new bridge and leave the Fourteenth Street Bridge in use until such time as we can take it down.

Mr. RICH. You will no more than get the one bridge up until someone in the District who thinks he knows it all will tear the other one down, and you will not be consulted about it.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I do not agree with the gentleman. The old

when it is good for service for years to come.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania had taken time to read the hearings that were held and which were printed several months ago on this subject. It may be that I am sure he would not make such statement.

Mr. RICH. I do not know what the hearings disclose. I have seen so many unwise things done here in the District of Columbia. Take for instance the underpass at Sixteenth Street, compared perpendicular to the one at Fourteenth Street. As long as you live here, you will rue doing such a ridiculous thing. It blocks an underway from Ninth Street to Twenty-fifth Street or further up Massachusetts Avenue as it should be, but you bloomed such a sound plan as that.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Evidently the gentleman has not read the hearings and does not know what information was before the committee.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that instead of tearing down the Fourteenth Street Bridge it should be permitted to remain intact and in use until the country gets on its feet.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The statements he has just made indicate the intent of this legislation. We are going to build a new bridge and leave the Fourteenth Street Bridge in use until such time as we can take it down.

Mr. RICH. You will no more than get the one bridge up until someone in the District who thinks he knows it all will tear the other one down, and you will not be consulted about it.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I do not agree with the gentleman. The old

bridge is not only a traffic bottleneck, but competent engineers have told the committee that it is rapidly becoming unsafe and needs to be replaced before it becomes necesary to condemn it in the interest of public safety.

Mr. RICH. See if that does not happen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "construct,", insert maintain, and operate."

Page 2. line 7, after "$7,000,000". insert the following: "In accordance with the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the construcgion of bridges over navigable waters', approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations in this act."

Page, 5, after line 14, add a new section as follows:

"Sec. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

bridge is not only a traffic bottleneck, but competent engineers have told the committee that it is rapidly becoming unsafe and needs to be replaced before it becomes necessary to condemn it in the interest of public safety.

Mr. NICK. See if that does not happen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "construct", insert maintain, and operate."

Page 2, line 7, after "$7,000,000". insert the following:

"In accordance with the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters', approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations in this act."

Page, 3, after line 14, and a new section as follows:

"Sec. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Extract from
Congressional Record-Senate

Page 8660-8661 July 10, 1946.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES ACROSS POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have considered at this time House bill 541 and Senate bill 2352, which have been unanimously favorably reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, and about which there is no controversy. The bills relate to the District of Columbia.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator makes the request without prejudice to the unfinished business?

Mr. HOEY. Yes; without prejudice to the unfinished business.

I first ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 541, authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges across the Potomac River.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I ask the Senator to explain briefly just what the bills are?

Mr. HOEY. This is a matter which has been in controversy for some time, but all the elements have agreed on this bill. It involves the construction of two bridges across the Potomac River for which the District pays half and the Government the other half. As I have said, all elements have agreed on the bill.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES ACROSS TIDEWATER STREAM

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have considered at this time House Bill 7241 and Senate 3955, which have been ordinarily favorably reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, and about which there is no controversy. The bills relate to the District of Columbia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator means the regular order without objection to the unfinished business?

Mr. HOEY. That without prejudice to the unfinished business, I first ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House bill 7241, authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges across the Potomac River.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. May I ask the Senator to explain briefly just what the bills are?

Mr. HOEY. This is a matter which has been in controversy for some time, but all the elements have agreed on this bill. It involves the construction of two bridges across the Potomac River for which the District now will and the Government the other half. As I have said, all elements have agreed on the bill,

and the House has unanimously passed it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I say that the Senator from North Carolina spoke to me about these bills yesterday. I canvassed as well as I could the minority members of the committee, and I found no objection to the bills.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, these are District bills?

Mr. HOEY. Yes; they relate only to the District of Columbia.

Mr. BARKLEY. And they are urgent?

Mr. HOEY. Yes; they are urgent.

Mr. BARKLEY. And they have been reported unanimously, and it is important that they be passed without delay.

Mr. HOEY. That is correct. There is no objection to either one of the bills.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, if I understand the request of the Senator from North Carolina, it is that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside?

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the request of the Senator from North Carolina is granted, immediately after action is taken on the bills the Senator from North Carolina has in mind, will the Senate resume the consideration of the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 541) authorising and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the POTOMAC River, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third and passed.

[PUBLIC LAW 643—79TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 798—2D SESSION]

[H. R. 7109]

AN ACT

To amend section 6 of Public Law Numbered 516 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 16, 1946.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of Public Law Numbered 516 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 16, 1946, entitled "An Act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes", is amended as follows: Wherever in said section 6 the words "National Capital Park Service" occur they are changed to read "National Park Service".

Approved August 7, 1946.

[PUBLIC LAW 516—79TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 586—2D SESSION]

[H. R. 541]

AN ACT

Authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two four-lane bridges to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to construct, maintain, and operate two four-lane bridges across the Potomac River to replace the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge, together with bridge approaches and roads connecting such bridges and approaches with streets and park roads in the District of Columbia and with roads and park roads on the Virginia side of the Potomac River, the south-bound bridge to be constructed as nearly as practicable in the location of the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge, and the north-bound bridge to be constructed within six hundred feet of the downstream side of the existing Fourteenth Street or Highway Bridge, at a cost not to exceed $7,000,000, in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations in this Act.

SEC. 2. The Federal agencies having control and jurisdiction over the lands at and adjacent to the ends of the two bridges shall transfer to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon their request, the areas to be occupied by said bridges, approaches, and connecting roads, all as more particularly described on plans of said bridges, approaches, and connecting roads approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Public Roads Administration.

SEC. 3. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to acquire by purchase or by condemnation any and all lands not under Federal jurisdiction or control in the State of Virginia needed for said bridges, approaches, and connecting roads, title to such land to be taken directly to and in the name of the United States; and in case a price satisfactory to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia cannot be agreed upon for the purchase of such land or in case the title cannot be made satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, then the latter is directed to procure such land by condemnation, and the expenses of procuring evidence of title, or condemnation, or both, shall be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this Act. Jurisdiction and control over any land acquired under the authority of this Act shall be transferred to the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to make such use of federally owned and controlled lands at and adjacent to the north and south ends of the respective bridges as may

Exhibit E-2

MINUTES OF FOURTH MEETING HELD BY SENATE COMMITTEE APPOINTED UNDER PUBLIC LAW 155, 79TH CONGRESS, TO APPROVE PLANS FOR IMPROVING THE SENATE CHAMBER AND RECONSTRUCTING THE ROOF OVER THE SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL

The Committee met in the Senate Committee on Rules Committee Room in the United States Capitol Building, at 3:00 P.M., Wednesday, May 22, 1946.

The following Members of the Committee were present:

Senator Charles O. Andrews, Chairman
Senator Harry F. Byrd
Senator Theodore F. Green

The following were also present:

David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol
Charles A. Henlock, Administrative Officer under the Architect of the Capitol
Francis P. Sullivan, Associate Architect employed by the Architect of the Capitol for the Senate and House Chamber improvements
John F. Harbeson, representing Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, employed by the Architect of the Capitol as Consultants for the project
Frederick V. Murphy, member of the Commission of Fine Arts, representing that Commission
H. B. Caemmerer, Secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Chairman stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider and approve, if acceptable to the Committee, the plans presented by the Architect of the Capitol for remodeling the Senate Chamber, authorized by Public Law 155, 79th Congress.

The Committee examined the plans and discussed them with the Architect of the Capitol and other members present.

The Architect of the Capitol presented to the Committee a report on the project describing the plans and containing his findings and recommendations as to the time and manner in which the work under the project should be carried forward.

Upon motion made by Senator Byrd and seconded by Senator Green, the plans were approved by the Committee; and the Chairman, acting for and with the approval of the Committee, placed his signature of approval on the four plans submitted.

The Committee also gave careful consideration to the report of the Architect of the Capitol, particularly to the following recommendations contained therein:

(a) That the detailed working drawings and specifications be proceeded with and completed within the next three or four months; bids be invited in the latter part of November or early December 1946; and placement of contracts be withheld until after Congress convenes in January 1947;

(b) That the bids received be presented to the Senate and House Committees for consideration in January upon the convening of the new Congress; legislation be requested in January to provide such increase in the present authorized limit of cost of $1,446,000 as may be necessary as a result of the bids received; contracts be placed not later than the end of February 1947; and the materials necessary to start the work be fabricated and delivered to the site by July 1947;

(c) That the construction and other work required for remodeling the Senate Chamber be undertaken during the summer of 1947 and completed before the convening of Congress in January 1948.

The Committee approved the report of the Architect of the Capitol, including the recommendations contained therein, with the following exceptions:

1. The Committee voted to delete the following language from the report:

On Page 3 - Lines 1 to 5 - Strike Out:

"also, where materials specified could not be obtained, or could not be obtained without prolonged delay, substitute materials would have to be accepted, resulting in a lowering of the high standard of quality and performance desired in carrying out the Senate Chamber improvements."

On Page 6 - Lines 6 to 9 - Strike Out:

"The materials to be used will be of domestic source unless it should be found necessary to substitute foreign materials where suitable ones are not obtainable in this country."

2. Senator Byrd suggested that the Architect of the Capitol give serious consideration to the feasibility of inviting bids at an earlier date than proposed in the report on certain items of materials - such as marble and steel - that might be scarce and on which delivery might be uncertain, without waiting for the completion of the working drawings and specifications for all items involved in the complete project; and that contracts for such items be placed in advance of the general contract for the remainder of the job.

The Architect of the Capitol stated that he would study the matter carefully with a view to following out the Senator's suggestion.

The Committee voted to insert the report of the Architect of the Capitol in the Congressional Record for the information of all of the Senators; and the Chairman directed that a copy of the Minutes of the Meeting be sent to Senator Vandenberg and Senator Taft who were unable to be present at the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.

The report of the Architect of the Capitol, as approved by the Committee and ordered to be made a part of the Minutes of the Meeting, follows:

May 22, 1946

ALTERATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF INTERIOR OF SENATE AND HOUSE CHAMBERS AND RECONSTRUCTION OF ROOFS AND SKYLIGHTS OVER SENATE AND HOUSE WINGS OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL BUILDING.

Approval of Plans

The Architect of the Capitol presents for the consideration and approval of the Senate Committee appointed under the Act of July 17, 1945, Public Law 155, 79th Congress, the plans for the Senate Chamber improvements authorized by that Act.

In this connection, the Act of July 17, 1945 provides in pertinent part, as follows:

> "*** the appropriation of $585,000 provided in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, approved June 27, 1940, as amended *** for the reconstruction of the roofs and skylights over the Senate and House wings of the United States Capitol *** shall be available also for the substitution of reinforced concrete roof slab for the skylights over the Senate and House Chambers, reconstruction of ceilings, redecoration, acoustical treatment, improved lighting, and other alterations, changes, and improvements in such Chambers: Provided further, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated *** such additional amounts as may be necessary for the additional improvements herein authorized: Provided further, That the project, insofar as it affects the Senate wing of the Capitol, shall be carried forward by the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with plans to be approved by a committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, upon recommendation of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds: ***.
>
> Sec. 2. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution for a total amount not exceeding $861,000 in addition to the aforesaid appropriation of $585,000 heretofore provided in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 27, 1940.

The plans, as submitted, represent designs developed by Francis P. Sullivan, Associate Architect, and Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, Consultants, in collaboration. The designs have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Architect of the Capitol, and they are acceptable to the several consultants on air conditioning, lighting, and acoustics, and to the structural engineers. In their present form, they are the result of the combined efforts and ideas of all concerned with their preparation.

The plans are described on pages 6, 7, 8 of this report.

Time of Performance of work in Senate Chamber

Delays that have occurred under the project to date, explained on pages 9, 10, 11 of this report, together with present unsettled industrial conditions, make it necessary for the Architect of the Capitol to recommend that the work of improving the Senate Chamber not be undertaken until the summer of 1947.

The Commissioner of Public Buildings, several large construction companies, and other sources have been consulted with regard to industrial conditions, and it is their consensus of opinion that in order to even attempt the Senate Chamber improvements this summer, it would be necessary to perform the work under non-competitive contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. Moreover, there is still such a critical scarcity of essential building materials, and labor conditions are such that there is little likelihood that contractors could live up to fixed delivery schedules necessary to complete the

job within a restricted period.

These facts are borne out forcefully in two letters which I have received and will make a part of the minutes of the meeting - one from Commissioner Reynolds to Colonel Dryden of the Veterans Administration, and the other from the Consolidated Engineering Company to the Architect of the Capitol.

Need for approval of plans at present time

Due to the proposed adjournment of Congress in July of this year and, at least, the possibility that Congress might not return until the following January, it is urgent that the plans for the Senate and House Chamber improvements be approved by the Senate and House Committees prior to such adjournment. Because of the time required, after approval of the plans, for the preparation of the detailed working drawings and specifications, inviting bids, award of contracts, and fabrication and delivery of materials to the site, the project cannot be started promptly in July 1947 if the Senate and House Committees wait until after the new Congress convenes in January 1947 to approve the plans.

Time required and proposed procedure after approval of plans

It is estimated that after the plans for the Senate and House Chamber improvements are approved by the Senate and House Committees, from 3 to 4 months will be required for preparation and completion of the detailed working drawings and specifications, and for inviting bids, and awarding contracts.

It is the plan of the Architect of the Capitol, once the plans have been approved by the Senate and House Committees, to have the associate architect and consulting engineers proceed with the completion of the working drawings and specifications, and in either the latter part of November or early part of December 1946 to invite bids, but to withhold the placement of contracts until after Congress convenes in January, at which time the bids will be presented to the Senate and House Committees for consideration, and legislation requested to provide such increase in the authorized limit of cost as may be necessary as a result of the bids received - - before awards are made by the Architect of the Capitol.

If the contracts are placed in January or February 1947, the materials necessary to start the work can be fabricated and delivered to the site by July 1947 - - it being estimated that from 4 to 5 months will be required for such deliveries.

Increased Costs

Now that the plans have been developed and the various improvements desired by the Senate and House Committees incorporated, and materials required for the job determined, it is estimated that in the light of

present conditions, in order to accomplish the project as presently planned, it will be necessary to request that the authorized limit of cost of $1,446,000 fixed for the project by the Acts of June 27, 1940 and July 17, 1945, be substantially increased.

Due to present unsettled conditions, an accurate estimate of the amount required cannot be made at this time; but it is certain that a substantial increase will be necessary. The original estimate included a reserve for features which could not be determined in advance of a more or less detailed study by the architects and engineers engaged for the different branches of the work. It is now apparent that this reserve will be more than exhausted by such items as improvements in the air conditioning and lighting systems, improvements in architectural treatment recommended by the consultants and the Commission of Fine Arts, stainless steel ceilings, insulation of roofs, sound amplifying system for the House Chamber, and new seating on the floor of the House.

Although there is no definite assurance that the improvements will cost less as a result of the deferment of the project, there is at least the expectation that the Government will have the benefit of closer and more intelligent competition from bidders under more favorable conditions. There will also be the advantage that before an increase in the authorized limit of cost of the project is requested, an estimate more nearly approaching the ultimate cost can be prepared based on actual bid prices.

#6 Rept. on Plans
Senate Chamber

Description of plans for Senate Chamber Improvements

The design of the Senate Chamber has been studied with motives derived from classic architecture from the same sources as used by the Architects of the earlier portions of the Capitol and of other buildings of the Early Republic, this design being fitted to thoroughly modern means of lighting, air conditioning, and acoustic treatment.

In the scheme as submitted, the walls of the lower portion of the Chamber will be of painted wood paneling separated by pilasters of colored marble with light marble caps and bases. Colored marble will be used for the columns flanking the Vice President's rostrum and for the base and sub-base around the Chamber; and the decorative panels in the four corners of the room and the door trim will be of light marble. The cornice will be of marble and the clock of bronze. The Vice President's desk and the desk of the clerks and reporters will be faced with marble.

The walls of the gallery will be provided with a marble wainscot approximately four feet high. The wall above the wainscot will be faced with an acoustical product covered with fabric such as velour brocade. The door trims and niches will be of light marble and new wood doors will be provided. A decorative frieze will be introduced at the junction of the walls and ceiling.

The existing gallery floor construction will be replaced with fire-proof material arranged in steps, the face of which will be of marble and the platforms covered with a noiseless flooring such as cork tile.

The existing gallery seats will be replaced with an improved type of noiseless seats with especially designed arms and ends corresponding with the remainder of the room. The existing desks in the Press Gallery will be replaced with new desks and this section of the gallery will be enlarged.

The treatment of the ceiling contemplates a relatively flat portion extending outward from the walls in which will be incorporated a series of decorative coffers, and a higher central portion curved in section and provided with a cove. This central portion will be constructed of stainless steel, perforated with small holes for the introduction of air conditioning, and painted. The rest of the ceiling will be of plaster. Back of the perforated portion an acoustical treatment will be introduced as may be necessary.

In the center of the ceiling will be introduced an ornamental rosette, the field of which will be of carved shatter-proof glass illuminated from above so as to furnish a visible source of direct light. This light source will be provided mainly for the sake of appearance of the Chamber. The actual lighting of the floor will be accomplished by reflected light from the ceiling, the source of which will be light outlets arranged around the perimeter of the cove.

Lighting for the gallery will be provided by light panels in the ceiling close to the walls. The final lighting arrangement, however, will be the result of a test demonstration at full scale now arranged for.

Air conditioning for the galleries will be introduced through semi-circular outlets around the wall at the back of the gallery. The air conditioning for the floor will be introduced through the perforations in the stainless steel ceiling already mentioned.

While the plans and the descriptions together present a view of the Chambers substantially as they are intended to be when remodeled, it is anticipated that some changes may be found necessary or desirable in materials, methods, and design as the working drawings are developed and opportunity is afforded for more detailed study of the problems involved. The architectural character, however, will be preserved, and the necessities of air conditioning, illumination, acoustics, and other practical features will have the most serious consideration.

Reconstruction of Roofs

The present roof construction with its skylights and iron trusses will be removed and replaced by reinforced concrete slabs and structural steel beams supported on steel trusses. The skylights in the connections between the central portion of the building and the two wings will likewise be eliminated and replaced by a concrete and steel roof. The new roof structure will be fireproof throughout. The existing cast iron ceiling with its glass panels will be removed

and such disposition made of the glass panels as may be decided upon. The roof will be insulated and covered with sheet copper. New air conditioning ducts will be run below the new roofs, eliminating the old ducts which are now on top of the roofs and thereby materially improving the air view of the building.

Delays encountered

When the Senate and House Chamber improvements were authorized by Congress in Public Law 155, approved July 17, 1945, the Architect of the Capitol advised the Senate and House Committees, appointed under that Law, that in order to have the materials fabricated and delivered to the site in time to start construction work within and above the Chambers on July 1, 1946, it would be necessary for the plans to be approved by the Committees and the working drawings completed, bids advertised for, and contracts awarded by March 1, 1946.

This schedule has been upset due to delays over which the Architect of the Capitol has had no control.

In the first instance, the Senate Committee decided on July 31, 1945, that in addition to procuring the services of Mr. Sullivan as Associate Architect, the Architect of the Capitol should also employ Mr. Paul P. Cret as Consultant to act as censor and critic of the Senate Chamber plans prepared by Mr. Sullivan, to confer with Mr. Sullivan and the Architect of the Capitol in the course of the preparation of such plans and drawings, and to recommend to the Architect of the Capitol any changes or improvements in such plans considered desirable.

While a contract was being negotiated with Mr. Cret in August 1945, Mr. Cret was taken seriously ill, and died on September 8, 1945. The Committee was informed of his death and the Architect of the Capitol requested that he be advised as to the Committee's wishes in the matter of the selection of another Consultant.

The Senate Committee, together with three Members of the House Committee, met on October 5, 1945, and at that meeting, which was also attended by members of the Commission of Fine Arts, both the Senate and House Committees requested the Commission of Fine Arts to recommend an architect to serve in the capacity in which it had been intended to have Mr. Cret act.

On October 8, 1945, the Commission of Fine Arts recommended to the Senate and House Committees that Mr. Cret's successors in office - Messrs. Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, architects of Philadelphia - be employed as consultants for the Senate and House Chamber improvements.

The House Committee approved the selection of these architects to serve as Consultant for the House Chamber improvements on November 23, 1945; and the Senate Committee approved the selection of these architects to serve as Consultant for the Senate Chamber improvements on November 26, 1945.

A contract was entered into with Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson on December 4, 1945.

#11 Report on Plans
Senate Chamber

Prior to the employment of the consultants, Mr. Sullivan proceeded as far as he could with his sketches and preliminary plans, but only limited progress could be made until the consultants were employed.

During the period December 4, 1945 to May 1946, Mr. Sullivan has collaborated and conferred closely with the consultants; also with the acoustical, air conditioning and lighting experts, and the structural engineers; and all matters of consequence have been taken up and discussed at length with the Architect of the Capitol. Meetings have been held in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol at which the various consultants have been represented and differences of opinion ironed out. Meetings have also been held with the Commission of Fine Arts and their recommendations have been incorporated in the plans. Numerous changes have been considered, and repeated revisions made in the plans in an effort to obtain the best architectural results without sacrificing acoustical, lighting, air conditioning and structural engineering requirements.

Had it not been for the circumstances herein enumerated, the plans developed and agreed upon during the period December 4, 1945 to April 1946, would normally have been developed and agreed upon during the period September 1, 1945 to January 1946.

Additional time has also been required to check the availability of materials proposed to be used, and to make a study of the effects that present unsettled industrial conditions would have, particularly with regard to costs, on attempting to carry forward the Senate and House Chamber improvements this year.

79TH CONGRESS } SENATE { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1389

RECONSTRUCTION OF ROOFS AND SKYLIGHTS OVER HOUSE AND SENATE WINGS OF THE CAPITOL

MAY 23 (legislative day, MARCH 5), 1946.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ANDREWS, from the special committee appointed under Public Law 155, submitted the following

REPORT

[Pursuant to Public Law 155, 79th Cong.]

The special Senate committee appointed under Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, at a meeting yesterday approved the plans for remodeling the Senate Chamber submitted by the Architect of the Capitol.

These plans, prepared by Francis P. Sullivan, associate architect, and Harbeson, Hough, Livingston, & Larson, consultants, in collaboration, have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Architect of the Capitol, and are acceptable to the several consultants on air conditioning, lighting, and acoustics, and to the structural engineers.

The committee also approved the report of the Architect of the Capitol on the project, describing the plans and recommending that the remodeling work be postponed until the summer of 1947.

The report of the Architect of the Capitol follows.

MAY 22, 1946.

ALTERATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF INTERIOR OF SENATE AND HOUSE CHAMBERS AND RECONSTRUCTION OF ROOFS AND SKYLIGHTS OVER SENATE AND HOUSE WINGS OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL BUILDING

APPROVAL OF PLANS

The Architect of the Capitol presents for the consideration and approval of the Senate committee appointed under the act of July 17, 1945 (Public Law 155, 79th Cong.), the plans for the Senate Chamber improvements authorized by that act.

In this connection, the act of July 17, 1945, provides in pertinent part as follows:

"* * * the appropriation of $585,000 provided in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, approved June 27, 1940, as amended * * * for the

reconstruction of the roofs and skylights over the Senate and House wings of the United States Capitol * * * shall be available also for the substitution of reinforced concrete roof slab for the skylights over the Senate and House Chambers, reconstruction of ceilings, redecoration, acoustical treatment, improved lighting, and other alterations, changes, and improvements in such Chambers: *Provided further*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated * * * such additional amounts as may be necessary for the additional improvements herein authorized: *Provided further*, That the project, insofar as it affects the Senate wing of the Capitol, shall be carried forward by the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with plans to be approved by a committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, upon recommendation of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds: * * *.

SEC. 2. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution for a total amount not exceeding $861,000 in addition to the aforesaid appropriation of $585,000 heretofore provided in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 27, 1940.

The plans, as submitted, represent designs developed by Francis P. Sullivan, associate architect, and Harbeson, Hough, Livingston, and Larson, consultants, in collaboration. The designs have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Architect of the Capitol, and they are acceptable to the several consultants on air conditioning, lighting, and acoustics, and to the structural engineers. In their present form, they are the result of the combined efforts and ideas of all concerned with their preparation.

The plans are described on pages 6, 7, and 8 of this report.

TIME OF PERFORMANCE OF WORK IN SENATE CHAMBER

Delays that have occurred under the project to date, explained on pages 3 and 4 of this report, together with present unsettled industrial conditions, make it necessary for the Architect of the Capitol to recommend that the work of improving the Senate Chamber not be undertaken until the summer of 1947.

The Commissioner of Public Buildings, several large construction companies, and other sources have been consulted with regard to industrial conditions, and it is their consensus of opinion that in order to even attempt the Senate Chamber improvements this summer, it would be necessary to perform the work under noncompetitive contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. Moreover, there is still such a critical scarcity of essential building materials, and labor conditions are such that there is little likelihood that contractors could live up to fixed delivery schedules necessary to complete the job within a restricted period.

These facts are borne out forcefully in two letters which I have received and will make a part of the minutes of the meeting: One from Commissioner Reynolds to Colonel Dryden of the Veterans' Administration, and the other from the Consolidated Engineering Co. to the Architect of the Capitol.

NEED FOR APPROVAL OF PLANS AT PRESENT TIME

Due to the proposed adjournment of Congress in July of this year and, at least, the possibility that Congress might not return until the following January, it is urgent that the plans for the Senate and House Chamber improvements be approved by the Senate and House committees prior to such adjournment. Because of the time required, after approval of the plans, for the preparation of the detailed working drawings and specifications, inviting bids, award of contracts, and fabrication and delivery of materials to the site, the project cannot be started promptly in July 1947 if the Senate and House committees wait until after the new Congress convenes in January 1947 to approve the plans.

TIME REQUIRED AND PROPOSED PROCEDURE AFTER APPROVAL OF PLANS

It is estimated that after the plans for the Senate and House Chamber improvements are approved by the Senate and House committees, from 3 to 4 months will be required for preparation and completion of the detailed working drawings, and specifications, and for inviting bids, and awarding contracts.

It is the plan of the Architect of the Capitol, once the plans have been approved by the Senate and House committees, to have the associate architect and consulting engineers proceed with the completion of the working drawings and specifications, and in either the latter part of November or early part of December 1946 to invite bids, but to withhold the placement of contracts until after Congress

convenes in January, at which time the bids will be presented to the Senate and House committees for consideration, and legislation requested to provide such increase in the authorized limit of cost as may be necessary as a result of the bids received—before awards are made by the Architect of the Capitol.

If the contracts are placed in January or February 1947, the materials necessary to start the work can be fabricated and delivered to the site by July 1947, it being estimated that from 4 to 5 months will be required for such deliveries.

INCREASED COSTS

Now that the plans have been developed and the various improvements desired by the Senate and House committees incorporated, and materials required for the job determined, it is estimated that in the light of present conditions, in order to accomplish the project as presently planned, it will be necessary to request that the authorized limit of cost of $1,446,000 fixed for the project by the acts of June 27, 1940, and July 17, 1945, be substantially increased.

Due to present unsettled conditions, an accurate estimate of the amount required cannot be made at this time, but it is certain that a substantial increase will be necessary. The original estimate included a reserve for features which could not be determined in advance of a more or less detailed study by the architects and engineers engaged for the different branches of the work. It is now apparent that this reserve will be more than exhausted by such items as improvements in the air conditioning and lighting systems, improvements in architectural treatment recommended by the consultants and the Commission of Fine Arts, stainless steel ceilings, insulation of roofs, sound-amplifying system for the House Chamber, and new seating on the floor of the House.

Although there is no definite assurance that the improvements will cost less as a result of the deferment of the project, there is at least the expectation that the Government will have the benefit of closer and more intelligent competition from bidders under more favorable conditions. There will also be the advantage that before an increase in the authorized limit of cost of the project is requested, an estimate more nearly approaching the ultimate cost can be prepared based on actual bid prices.

DESCRIPTION OF PLANS FOR SENATE CHAMBER IMPROVEMENTS

The design of the Senate Chamber has been studied with motives derived from classic architecture from the same sources as used by the architects of the earlier portions of the Capitol and of other buildings of the early Republic, this design being fitted to thoroughly modern means of lighting, air conditioning, and acoustic treatment.

In the scheme as submitted, the walls of the lower portion of the Chamber will be of painted-wood paneling separated by pilasters of colored marble with light marble caps and bases. Colored marble will be used for the columns flanking the Vice President's rostrum and for the base and subbase around the Chamber; and the decorative panels in the four corners of the room and the door trim will be of light marble. The cornice will be of marble and the clock of bronze. The Vice President's desk and the desk of the clerks and reporters will be faced with marble.

The walls of the gallery will be provided with a marble wainscot approximately 4-feet high. The wall above the wainscot will be faced with an acoustical product, covered with fabric such as velour brocade. The door trims and niches will be of light marble and new wood doors will be provided. A decorative frieze will be introduced at the junction of the walls and ceiling.

The existing gallery floor construction will be replaced with fireproof material arranged in steps, the face of which will be of marble, and the platforms covered with a noiseless flooring such as cork tile.

The existing gallery seats will be replaced with an improved type of noiseless seats, with especially designed arms and ends corresponding with the remainder of the room. The existing desks in the Press Gallery will be replaced with new desks and this section of the gallery will be enlarged.

The treatment of the ceiling contemplates a relatively flat portion extending outward from the walls in which will be incorporated a series of decorative coffers, and a higher central portion curved in section and provided with a cove. This central portion will be constructed of stainless steel, perforated with small holes for the introduction of air conditioning, and painted. The rest of the ceiling will be of plaster. Back of the perforated portion an acoustical treatment will be introduced as may be necessary.

In the center of the ceiling will be introduced an ornamental rosette, the field of which will be of carved shatter-proof glass illuminated from above so as to furnish a visible source of direct light. This light source will be provided mainly for the sake of appearance of the Chamber. The actual lighting of the floor will be accomplished by reflected light from the ceiling, the source of which will be light outlets arranged around the perimeter of the cove.

Lighting for the gallery will be provided by light panels in the ceiling close to the walls. The final lighting arrangement, however, will be the result of a test demonstration at full scale now arranged for.

Air conditioning for the galleries will be introduced through semicircular outlets around the wall at the back of the gallery. The air conditioning for the floor will be introduced through the perforations in the stainless-steel ceiling already mentioned.

While the plans and the descriptions together present a view of the Chambers substantially as they are intended to be when remodeled, it is anticipated that some changes may be found necessary or desirable in materials, methods, and design as the working drawings are developed and opportunity is afforded for more detailed study of the problems involved. The architectural character, however, will be preserved, and the necessities of air conditioning, illumination acoustics, and other practical features will have the most serious consideration,

RECONSTRUCTION OF ROOFS

The present roof construction with its skylights and iron trusses will be removed and replaced by reinforced concrete slabs and structural steel beams supported on steel trusses. The skylights in the connections between the central portion of the building and the two wings will likewise be eliminated and replaced by a concrete and steel roof. The new roof structure will be fireproof throughout. The existing cast iron ceiling with its glass panels will be removed and such disposition made of the glass panels as may be decided upon. The roof will be insulated and covered with sheet copper. New air-conditioning ducts will be run below the new roofs, eliminating the old ducts which are now on top of the roofs and thereby materially improving the air view of the building.

DELAYS ENCOUNTERED

When the Senate and House Chamber improvements were authorized by Congress in Public Law 155, approved July 17, 1945, the Architect of the Capitol advised the Senate and House committees, appointed under that law, that in order to have the materials fabricated and delivered to the site in time to start construction work within and above the Chambers on July 1, 1946, it would be necessary for the plans to be approved by the committees and the working drawings completed, bids advertised for, and contracts awarded by March 1, 1946.

This schedule has been upset due to delays over which the Architect of the Capitol has had no control.

In the first instance, the Senate committee decided on July 31, 1945, that, in addition to procuring the services of Mr. Sullivan as associate architect, the Architect of the Capitol should also employ Mr. Paul P. Cret as consultant, to act as censor and critic of the Senate Chamber plans prepared by Mr. Sullivan, to confer with Mr. Sullivan and the Architect of the Capitol in the course of the preparation of such plans and drawings, and to recommend to the Architect of the Capitol any changes or improvements in such plans considered desirable.

While a contract was being negotiated with Mr. Cret in August 1945, Mr. Cret was taken seriously ill, and died on September 8, 1945. The committee was informed of his death and the Architect of the Capitol requested that he be advised as to the committee's wishes in the matter of the selection of another consultant.

The Senate committee, together with three members of the House committee, met on October 5, 1945, and at that meeting, which was also attended by members of the Commission of Fine Arts, both the Senate and House committees requested the Commission of Fine Arts to recommend an architect to serve in the capacity in which it had been intended to have Mr. Cret act.

On October 8, 1945, the Commission of Fine Arts recommended to the Senate and House committees that Mr. Cret's successors in office—Messrs. Harbeson, Hough, Livingston, and Larson, architects of Philadelphia—be employed as consultants for the Senate and House Chamber improvements.

The House committee approved the selection of these architects to serve as consulant for the House Chamber improvements on November 23, 1945, and the

Senate committee approved the selection of these architects to serve as consultant for the Senate Chamber improvements on November 26, 1945.

A contract was entered into with Harveson, Hough, Livingston, and Larson on December 4, 1945.

Prior to the employment of the consultants, Mr. Sullivan proceeded as far as he could with his sketches and preliminary plans, but only limited progress could be made until the consultants were employed.

During the period December 4, 1945, to May 1946, Mr. Sullivan has collaborated and conferred closely with the consultants; also with the acoustical, air-conditioning, and lighting experts, and the structural engineers; and all matters of consequence have been taken up and discussed at length with the Architect of the Capitol. Meetings have been held in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, at which the various consultants have been represented and differences of opinion ironed out. Meetings have also been held with the Commission of Fine Arts, and their recommendations have been incorporated in the plans. Numerous changes have been considered and repeated revisions made in the plans in an effort to obtain the best architectural results without sacrificing acoustical, lighting, air-conditioning, and structural engineering requirements.

Had it not been for the circumstances herein enumerated, the plans developed and agreed upon during the period December 4, 1945, to April 1946, would normally have been developed and agreed upon during the period September 1, 1945, to January 1946.

Additional time has also been required to check the availability of materials proposed to be used, and to make a study of the effects that present unsettled industrial conditions would have, particularly with regard to costs, on attempting to carry forward the Senate and House Chamber improvements this year.

○

JUN 14 1946

ALTERATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF INTERIOR OF SENATE AND HOUSE CHAMBERS AND RECONSTRUCTION OF ROOFS AND SKYLIGHTS OVER SENATE AND HOUSE WINGS OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL BUILDING.

Approval of Plans

The Architect of the Capitol presents for the consideration and approval of the House Committee appointed under the Act of July 17, 1945, Public Law 155, 79th Congress, the plans for the House Chamber improvements authorized by that Act.

Before proceeding with a discussion of these plans, I wish to advise that the Senate Committee appointed under Public Law 155 approved the plans for the Senate Chamber improvements on May 22, 1946.

The Act of July 17, 1945, authorizing the remodelling of the Senate and House Chambers and requiring approval of the remodelling plans by the Senate and House Committees, provides in pertinent part, as follows:

> "*** the appropriation of $585,000 provided in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, approved June 27, 1940, as amended*** for the reconstruction of the roofs and skylights over the Senate and House wings of the United States Capitol *** shall be available also for the substitution of reinforced concrete roof slab for the skylights over the Senate and House Chambers, reconstruction of ceilings, redecoration, acoustical treatment, improved lighting, and other alterations, changes, and improvements in such Chambers: Provided further, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated *** such additional amounts as may be necessary for the additional improvements herein authorized: Provided further, That the project, insofar as it affects the Senate wing of the Capitol, shall be carried forward by the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with plans to be approved by a committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, upon recommendation of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds: Provided further, That the project, insofar as it affects the House wing of the Capitol, shall be carried forward by the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with plans to be approved by a committee of five Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, upon recommendation of the chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
>
> "Sec. 2. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into a contract or contracts for carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution for a total amount not exceeding $861,000 in addition to the aforesaid appropriation of $585,000 heretofore provided in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 27, 1940."

The plans, as submitted, represent designs developed by Francis P. Sullivan, Associate Architect, and Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, Consultants, in collaboration. The designs have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Architect of the Capitol, and they are acceptable to the several consultants on air conditioning, lighting, and acoustics, and to the structural engineers. In their present form, they are the result of the combined efforts and ideas of all concerned with their preparation.

The plans are described on pages 6, 7, 8 of this report.

Time of Performance of work in House Chamber

Delays that have occurred under the project to date, explained on pages 9, 10, 11 of this report, together with present unsettled industrial conditions, make it necessary for the Architect of the Capitol to recommend that the work of improving the House Chamber not be undertaken until the summer of 1947. The Senate Committee has already approved deferment of the Senate Chamber remodelling work until that date.

The Commissioner of Public Buildings, several large construction companies, and other sources have been consulted with regard to industrial conditions, and it is their consensus of opinion that in order to even attempt the House and Senate Chamber improvements this summer, it would be necessary to perform the work under non-competitive contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

The plans, as submitted, represent typical developed by Frederic A. Sullivan, Associate Architect, and Harbeson, Hough, Livingston & Larson, Consulting Architects, in collaboration. The design is now a source of the Commission of Fine Arts and Members of the Legislature, and may be accepted in its general characteristics as submitted, but the working drawings of all such must be submitted for approval.

The plans are accepted as per Mr. C. of this report.

Elevation Treatment of Wall in Rotunda

Mr. Bldg. has been requested to submit photographs showing on page 9, 10, 11 of this report, together with present materials in detail condition, note it necessary for the Architect of the Capitol to recommend that the work of improving this Rotunda not be undertaken until the state of [illegible]. The Architect has already [illegible] the source of the [illegible] work will also [illegible].

The Committee of Public Building, Council Acting Chairman, and other persons have been consulted with regard to the desirability of [illegible] in the Rotunda, and it is the opinion that the Committee is opposed to any [illegible] in the Rotunda. [illegible] Harbeson, Hough, Livingston & Larson, Consulting Architects, in collaboration of the Commission of Fine Arts and Members of the Legislature, and may be accepted in its general characteristics as submitted, but the working drawings of all such must be submitted for approval.

The plans are accepted as per Mr. C. of this report.

Moreover, there is still such a critical scarcity of essential building materials, and labor conditions are such that there is little likelihood that contractors could live up to fixed delivery schedules necessary to complete the job within a restricted period.

These facts are borne out forcefully in two letters which I have received - one from Commissioner Reynolds to Colonel Dryden of the Veterans Administration, and the other from the Consolidated Engineering Company to the Architect of the Capitol.

Need for approval of plans at present time

Due to the proposed adjournment of Congress in July of this year and, at least, the possibility that Congress might not return until the following January, it is urgent that the plans for the House Chamber improvements be approved by the House Committee prior to such adjournment. Because of the time required, after approval of the plans, for the preparation of the detailed working drawings and specifications, inviting bids, award of contracts, and fabrication and delivery of materials to the site, the project cannot be started promptly in July 1947 if the House Committee waits until after the new Congress convenes in January 1947 to approve the plans.

Mr Lugo, on Zoom
Room Observer

However, there is still some critical remedial work to
satisfy essential, but labor-consuming work that does in
fact the Authorized Improvements would have up to fixed delivery
schedules necessary to complete the job within a restricted period.

Those issue are being addressed in two ways which I have
received - one from Commissioner Reynolds of the Federal Region of
the Veterans Administration, and the other from the Consolidated
Engineering Company in the aftermath of the Depiction.

Need for approval of change to current plan

Due to the protracted adjournment of Congress in July of this year
and, at least, the possibility that Congress might not return
until the following January, it is my view that the plans for
the House chamber improvements as approved by the House Committee
prior to such adjournment. Because of the time required,
clear approval of the plans, for the preparation of the detailed
working drawings and specifications, awarding bids, award of
contracts, and fabrication and delivery of materials to the site,
the project cannot be started promptly in July 1947 if the House
Committee waits until after the new Congress convenes in January
1947 to approve the plans.

Time required and proposed procedure after approval of plans

It is estimated that after the plans for the House Chamber improvements are approved by the House Committee, from 3 to 4 months will be required for preparation and completion of the detailed working drawings and specifications, and for inviting bids, and awarding contracts.

It is the plan of the Architect of the Capitol, once the plans have been approved by the House Committee, to have the associate architect and consulting engineers proceed with the completion of the working drawings and specifications, and in either the latter part of November or early part of December 1946 to invite bids, but to withhold the placement of contracts until after Congress convenes in January, at which time the bids will be presented to the Senate and House Committees for consideration, and legislation requested to provide such increase in the authorized limit of cost as may be necessary as a result of the bids received - - before awards are made by the Architect of the Capitol.

unless satisfactory bids can be secured

If the contracts are placed in January or February 1947, the materials necessary to start the work can be fabricated and delivered to the site by July 1947 - - it being estimated that from 4 to 5 months will be required for such deliveries.

Increased Costs

Now that the plans have been developed and the various improvements desired by the Senate and House Committees incorporated, and materials required for the job determined, it is estimated that in the light of

Time required and proposed procedure for Board action

It is considered that plans for the Moore Quarter improvements approved by the Board October 3 in 4 months will be required for preparation and completion of the detailed working drawings and specifications, and for awarding contracts.

It is the plan of the Architect of the Building, as the plans are approved by the Board, to submit sets of working drawings to a number of responsible contractors, and to obtain the lowest bids; and to advertise for the receipt of bids, and to award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder, and to obtain the lowest bid. Bids will be received until 2 o'clock p.m. on the 15th day of December 1939 in twelve days, and it will be possible to award the contract before the end of January, so that the work can be started by the middle of February at the latest. Bids will be received at the Board Room of the Building, and the contract will be awarded by the Board.

If the contracts are given in January or February 1940, the work necessary to meet the move can be finished and delivered to the city by July 1941 - 18 months allowing 4 to 5 months will be required for such alterations.

Increased costs

How much the plans have developed and the various improvements desired by the Courts and House Committees investigated, and materials required for the job determined, it is estimated that in the light of

present conditions, in order to accomplish the project as presently planned, it will be necessary to request that the authorized limit of cost of $1,446,000 fixed for the project by the Acts of June 27, 1940 and July 17, 1945, be substantially increased.

Due to present unsettled conditions, an accurate estimate of the amount required cannot be made at this time; but it is certain that a substantial increase will be necessary. The original estimate included a reserve for features which could not be determined in advance of a more or less detailed study by the architects and engineers engaged for the different branches of the work. It is now apparent that this reserve will be more than exhausted by such items as improvements in the air conditioning and lighting systems, improvements in architectural treatment recommended by the consultants and the Commission of Fine Arts, stainless steel ceilings, insulation of roofs, sound amplifying system for the House Chamber, and new seating on the floor of the House.

Although there is no definite assurance that the improvements will cost less as a result of the deferment of the project, there is at least the expectation that the Government will have the benefit of closer and more intelligent competition from bidders under more favorable conditions. There will also be the advantage that before an increase in the authorized limit of cost of the project is requested, an estimate more nearly approaching the ultimate cost can be prepared based on actual bid prices.

based on normal life patterns.

Description of plans for House Chamber Improvements

In remodelling the House Chamber, it is planned to retain certain features which have become an inseparable part of the Chamber in the course of time. The flag will be placed behind the Speaker's chair, hung as at present, but framed in a columned motif and flanked by sculpture symbolizing the nation's law-making body. The oil paintings of Washington by Vanderlyn and Lafayette by Ary Scheffer are to be placed on the same wall of the Chamber, centered between the doors, and suitably framed.

In the scheme of decoration of the room, the base and the central motif (Speaker's rostrum) will be of a marble of a depth of color and veining such as that used in the old Supreme Court Room in the Capitol, and the walls, with their fluted pilasters and panels, and the cornice are to be of wood cabinet work, painted in the manner of the Early Republic, the frieze in the cornice being a darker tone. The clock over the rostrum, to be done by a sculptor, flanked by suitable allegorical figures, will be of marble and bronze; grilles for the sound amplifying system will be of bronze, located over the doors.

In order to obtain adequate space in the Press Gallery and space needed for the proper installation of public address equipment, the south of the Chamber will be brought forward about one foot and the north wall brought forward to correspond.

The gallery will have new upholstered, noiseless seats of new type with arms and ends designed in harmony with the new room, the Press Gallery to be widened and enlarged and provided with new desks and seats. The new gallery floor construction will be of fire-proof material, arranged in steps. The face of the steps will be of marble, the floor platforms of a noiseless material such as cork tile.

Description of Alternative Floor Treatments

In remodelling the Dome Chamber, it is planned to retain certain existing floor treatments as integral parts of the Observer Lounge in the Dome of the Capitol. The floor will be glazed between the Speaker's chair, rising on the present, and from it to the Visitors' Gallery, rising in steps. The floor of the stage will be of marble, the floor platforms of marble and oak, and the aisles of carpet. The new gallery floor construction will be of reinforced concrete, carried on steel columns and girders. The old marble floor slabs will be used in the new floor, and the floor platforms of oak will be finished with oak strip flooring.

It has become standard practice in modern theatre design to provide a sloping floor (commonly called a "rake") for the auditorium. The rake of the floor of the Observer Lounge will be in the form of a concave curve. This curve will be determined by a mathematical formula of the parabola, which will provide the best possible vision for the crowd supplied by the least possible rise. Located over the dome, the Observer Lounge will be provided with a carpeted floor. The curve of the floor will be determined by a mathematical formula of the parabola, which will provide the best possible vision for the crowd supplied by the least possible rise. Located over the dome, the Observer Lounge will be provided with a carpeted floor.

In order to obtain adequate space at the Floor Gallery and to provide for proper ventilation of public gallery, the wall of the Observer will be brought forward to correspond with the Floor Gallery wall. The floor of the Observer Lounge will be carpeted and the walls and ceiling decorated in keeping with the Floor Gallery. The new Gallery floor construction will be of reinforced concrete, carried on steel columns and girders. The old marble floor slabs will be used in the new floor, and the floor platforms of oak will be finished with oak strip flooring.

The door frames and the wainscot will be of light marble; over the doors will be sculptured panels in high relief depicting such suitable symbols as the trade and commerce of the country and its natural resources, or appropriate incised inscriptions. The panels between the doors will be of acoustical material, faced with a velour brocade.

The main cornice of the room and the coffered border of the ceiling will be of plaster, painted. Air conditioning for the galleries will be introduced through semi-circular outlets in this flat border portion of the ceiling near the walls.

The center of the ceiling, higher and of curved section springing from a cove which will contain continuous light sources screened from view, will be constructed of stainless steel, painted, and perforated with small holes, which will serve as the means of introducing the air conditioning for the central part of the room. The air chamber above this perforated ceiling will be lined with acoustic material.

In the center of the ceiling will be an ornamental feature of carved shatterproof glass, illuminated from above, to furnish a visible source of direct light for the appearance of the Chamber. The main lighting will be indirect in nature - from the cove lights around the center of the ceiling, mentioned above, from lights on the top of the wall in front of the gallery (all sources screened from view), and from other sources placed about the Chamber; the final lighting arrangement to be the result of a test demonstration at full scale now arranged for.

The scheme of decoration has been studied to harmonize with the architecture of those portions of the Capitol Building of the period of the early Republic, insofar as this can be done while providing for thoroughly modern lighting, air conditioning, and acoustic treatment.

In modern living, the social customs and economic pressures
early Christian, Oriental, or Gothic ages. Provision for elaborate
because of those pressures on the physical relationship of the parishioners
to the church and ceremonies of the country and its reduced resources, it
will be very unwise to provide in high relief lighting such unusable spaces
The door frames and the windows will be of light bronze over the doors
and windows proper. The panels between the doors will be
of clear plate glass, mounted with bronze moldings. The panels above the doors
will be filled with stained glass in rich but restrained colors of a
design which will symbolize the purpose of the building.

The entire floor of the church and the adjoining parish house
will be covered throughout with cork tile in rich but restrained colors of a
pattern which will be in keeping with the dignity of the building.
The vestibule floor will be of marble, and the corridors and stairs
will be covered with rubber tile. The floor of the church proper
will be covered with carpet. The pews will be upholstered with real
leather, which will be of a color to harmonize with the carpet and
the general color scheme of the church. The pew floors will be laid
over the concrete floor of the church. The pew floors will be elevated
by the construction of the platform, and the pews will be set on
platforms. Under the platform and pews will be placed electrical
heating units, which will be controlled by thermostats so as to maintain
a most desirable temperature during the winter months.

The walls of the church proper will be of plaster, tinted with
delicate colors, which will harmonize with the carpet and the pews.
The ceiling will be finished with acoustic plaster. The ceiling
of the auditorium will be of a type which will prevent echoes and
reverberations, and will be treated with decorative colors and gold.
The lighting will be indirect in character, and the lighting units
will be installed in such a manner as to be invisible from the
auditorium. The lighting will be of a type which will prevent glare
and will be controlled by dimmers so as to produce various degrees
of illumination. The main lighting
fixtures will be of a design to harmonize with the general
character of the building, and will be of bronze finish.

The Members' seats on the floor of the Chamber will be replaced with new and more comfortable seating, and will be rearranged so as to eliminate the seats in the row nearest the south wall, which are inferior from the point of view of vision and hearing, and to place more seats in the section in front of the Speaker's desk. In this rearrangement the aisles will lead more directly to the exits and space will be obtained for enlarging the galleries.

It is recommended that the seven portrait busts formerly in niches in the upper walls be placed in more dignified setting in the domed lobby of the old House Office Building. It would be impossible to have busts all around the room, as some of the niches are such in front only without any depth. It is also recommended that the fresco painting of Washington at Yorktown by Brumidi be carefully removed and reset in a suitable location elsewhere.

While the plans and the descriptions together present a view of the House Chamber substantially as that Chamber is intended to be when remodelled, it is anticipated that some changes may be found necessary or desirable in materials, methods, and design as the working drawings are developed and opportunity is afforded for more detailed study of the problems involved. The architectural character, however, will be preserved, and the necessities of air conditioning, illumination, acoustics, and other practical features will have the most serious consideration.

Reconstruction of Roofs

The present roof construction with its skylights and iron trusses will be removed and replaced by reinforced concrete slabs and structural steel beams supported on steel trusses. The skylights in the House and Senate connections between the central portion of the building and the wings will likewise be eliminated and replaced by a concrete and steel roof. The new roof structure will be fire-proof throughout. The existing cast iron ceiling with its glass panels will be removed from each Chamber.

and such disposition made of the glass panels as may be decided upon. The roof will be insulated and covered with sheet copper. New air conditioning ducts will be run below the new roofs, eliminating the old ducts which are now on top of the roofs and thereby materially improving the air view of the building.

Delays encountered

When the Senate and House Chamber improvements were authorized by Congress in Public Law 155, approved July 17, 1945, the Architect of the Capitol advised the Senate and House Committees, appointed under that Law, that in order to have the materials fabricated and delivered to the site in time to start construction work within and above the Chambers on July 1, 1946, it would be necessary for the plans to be approved by the Committees and the working drawings completed, bids advertised for, and contracts awarded by March 1, 1946.

This schedule has been upset due to delays over which the Architect of the Capitol has had no control.

In the first instance, the Senate Committee decided on July 31, 1945, that in addition to procuring the services of Mr. Sullivan as Associate Architect, the Architect of the Capitol should also employ Mr. Paul P. Cret as Consultant to act as censor and critic of the Senate Chamber plans prepared by Mr. Sullivan, to confer with Mr. Sullivan and the Architect of the Capitol in the course of the preparation of such plans and drawings, and to recommend to the Architect of the Capitol any changes or improvements in such plans considered desirable.

considered unattainable.

Architects of the Capitol any changes or improvements in site or plan
pertaining to room usage and furnishing, must be submitted to the
Mr. Oliveros and the Architect of the Capitol in the course of his
periodic visits to the Capitol. Mr. Oliveros, the Senate Chief Clerk,
and such other persons as may be deemed
The roof will be insulated and covered with sheet copper. Heavy
condensing doors will be run below the new floor. Wherever the
old ducts which are now on top of the roofs and chimney are built
impairing the air flow of the hall ducts.

Lighting engineering

When the Capitol was remodelled Congress was authorized by
Congress in March 1857, approved July 17, 1862, the Architect
of the Capitol ... and House Committees, appointed
under such law, shall be made ... more the materials fabricated and
delivered to the ... for ... to secure construction work, which and
above the Chamber. ... by ..., 1866, it would be necessary for the
plans to be approved by the Committees and the working drawings com-
pleted, with several ... and contracts awarded by ..., 1866.

This schedule was then upset due to delays over which the Architect
of the Capitol had no control.

In the latter instance, Mr. Brumidi's Grecian dress ... July 2, 1863,
that an addition to ... the services of Mr. Guillaume in the re-
modelling, the Architect of the Capitol should also employ
Mr. Paul P. Cret as ... , such ... and artists of the
Mr. Oliveros and the Architect of the Capitol, in the course of his
periodic visits to the Capitol, and such other persons as may be deemed

While a contract was being negotiated with Mr. Cret in August 1945, Mr. Cret was taken seriously ill, and died on September 8, 1945. The Committee was informed of his death and the Architect of the Capitol requested that he be advised as to the Committee's wishes in the matter of the selection of another Consultant.

The Senate Committee, together with three Members of the House Committee, met on October 5, 1945; and at that meeting, which was also attended, upon invitation of the Committee, by members of the Commission of Fine Arts, both the Senate and House Committees requested the Commission of Fine Arts to recommend an architect to serve in the capacity in which it had been intended to have Mr. Cret act.

On October 8, 1945, the Commission of Fine Arts recommended to the Senate and House Committees that Mr. Cret's successors in office - Messrs. Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, architects of Philadelphia - be employed as consultants for the Senate and House Chamber improvements.

The House Committee approved the selection of these architects to serve as Consultant for the House Chamber improvements on November 23, 1945; and the Senate Committee approved the selection of these architects to serve as Consultant for the Senate Chamber improvements on November 26, 1945.

A contract was entered into with Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson on December 4, 1945.

Myrtle ... conference was finally negotiated with Mrs. Grant in August 1845, ...
... signed with Green Lawrence Hill, and dated on September 8, 1845.
The Committee was informed of this deed and the withdrawal of his
Capital requirements that he be advised ... to his Committee's actions
in the matter of ... selection of ... Commissioners.

The Pierce Committee, together with other Pierce ... of the ... Com-
mittee, met on October 5, 1845; and at once proceeded ... with ... the Com-
mittee, upon invitation of the Committee, by unanimous ... the Com-
mittee of Fifty Acres, from the owners and Pierce ... with ... re-
ceived the Committee of Fifty Acres to proceed ... unofficial ... there in an
official ... which it had been ... to have ...

On October 8, 1845, the Commission of Fifty Acres ... to the
Executive and House Committee that Mr. Grant's ... by ... -
Messrs. Pierce, Fenton, Livingston, and Lucas, ... of
Philadelphia - be employed ... Commissioners ... to ... the Pierce
Chamber improvements.

The House Committee approved the selection of these gentlemen to
serve on Commission for the Pierce Chamber improvements on November
25, 1845; and the Senate Committee approved the selection of these
gentlemen to serve as Commissioners ... on November 26, 1845.

A contract was entered into with Thompson, Hough, Livingston, and
Lucas on December 6, 1845.

Prior to the employment of the consultants, Mr. Sullivan proceeded as far as he could with his sketches and preliminary plans, but only limited progress could be made until the consultants were employed.

During the period December 4, 1945 to May 1946, Mr. Sullivan has collaborated and conferred closely with the consultants; also with the acoustical, air conditioning and lighting experts, and the structural engineers; and all matters of consequence have been taken up and discussed at length with the Architect of the Capitol. Meetings have been held in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol at which the various consultants have been represented and differences of opinion ironed out. Meetings have also been held with the Commission of Fine Arts and their recommendations have been incorporated in the plans. Numerous changes have been considered, and repeated revisions made in the plans in an effort to obtain the best architectural results without sacrificing acoustical, lighting, air conditioning and structural engineering requirements.

Had it not been for the circumstances herein enumerated, the plans developed and agreed upon during the period December 4, 1945 to April 1946, would normally have been developed and agreed upon during the period September 1, 1945 to January 1946.

Additional time has also been required to check the availability of materials proposed to be used, and to make a study of the effects that present unsettled industrial conditions would have, particularly with regard to costs, on attempting to carry forward the Senate and House Chamber improvements this year.

Prior to the employment of the consultants, Dr. Sullivan ... as far as he could with the drawings and preliminary pl... only limited progress could be made until the consultants were employed.

During the period December 1, 1945 to July 1946 ... architectural and engineering ... the commercial, air conditioning and lighting ... and the ... to one thousand at length with the exception of the Chemical ... Plans must have been in the office of the Architect at ... months in advance of opening date. ... been prepared and ... of opinion issued out. Mooreland have also been ... in this ... The plans ... have been materially ... in the ... and ... revisions ... Mooreland ... in the ... to obtain the ... changes ... Mooreland ... in the ... to be ... to ... Mooreland ... in the ... to ... Mooreland ... in the ... to ... Mooreland ... in the